

RIGHT

e 17, United States Code) governs
ctions of copyrighted materials
tions. In addition, the United States
ns of various international
amations.

w, libraries and archives are
eproduction. One of these specified
tion is not to be "used for any
o, or research." If a user makes a
roduction for purposes in excess of
ght infringement.

o accept a copying order if, in its
olve violation of copyright law.



THE
CONVERT'S GUIDE
TO
FIRST PRINCIPLES;
OR
EVANGELICAL TRUTH

SUSTAINED BY

THE UNITED TESTIMONY OF OUR LORD
JESUS CHRIST, THE HOLY APOS-
TLES, AND OUR PEDOBAP-
TIST BRETHREN.

COMPILED BY *Israel* H. ROBORDS,
Pastor of the First Baptized Church, New Haven, Ct.

"He that is first in his own cause seemeth just; but his neighbor cometh and searcheth him."—*Prov. xviii. 17.*

"The business of an argument is to prove, and not to suppose or take for granted, the very thing which is to be proved."—*Pres. Edwards, vol. iv. p. 44.*

Given by
Estate of Charles E. Hewitt.
NEW HAVEN:

WILLIAM STORER, JUN., PRINTER.

1838.

BX6331

RG6

P R E F A C E.

My apology for offering these few pages to the public, is found in the history of the recent glorious revival of religion in this city. Soon after I came to this place, God poured out his Spirit upon the Baptist church and congregation, and many were converted. The first Lord's day in April, I baptized 27; the second, 54, and so on, until near 200 were added by baptism, and 20 or 30 by letter. At this time, sprinkling, pouring, dipping, and close communion became the topic among our opponents. To put a stop to this, and turn the attention of the people to the Bible, I made public this proposition: "I will put myself under legal bonds, to pay as a free reward, \$3000, for finding in any of the received versions of the Bible, sprinkling or pouring for the action, and infants for the subjects of baptism,—\$1000 to be paid on finding each of the above. To decide this impartially, the texts supposed to contain the doctrine shall be submitted, without debate, to Dr. TAYLOR, of Yale College, and two learned pious Quakers. This proposition must be accepted by some clergyman or respectable member of one of the churches of this city." No one accepted the offer; but directly, pulpits, presses, pamphlets and newspapers, like so many guns from a common battery, were made to bear upon the Baptist church and her doctrines, and every movement in the religious community indicated a war of words. I made application to respond through the "Chronicle," but was promptly refused. These, with other circumstances and events of the time, furnish at once an occasion and an apology for my present effort.

It is obvious that error often changes its connection, assumes new positions, and accommodates itself to prevailing customs and prejudices; therefore we must be ready to meet it with weapons corresponding with the mode of attack. For instance, the editor of the Chronicle, professing to be wise, gives us the meaning of the word βαπτίζω, thus: βαπτίζω: βρέχω, *to wet, moisten, bedew*. In turn, I will give him the meaning of the phrase, "Editor of the Chronicle," thus: "EDITOR OF THE CHRONICLE:" BAT: *a flying mouse; a quadruped weighing about one ounce*. See John iii. 19, 20.

In judicial controversies, much depends on good evidence. Suppose there were two associations or companies of men in this city, of ten each, which were obliged to appeal to a legal tribunal to establish their respective claims, and all the evidence they have is within themselves. You will see at once there can be nothing done, on the principles of law or equity, except one company can draw testimony from the adverse party. This principle of jurisprudence must be carried into all polemic religious discussions. Now the world is divided into Baptist and Pedobaptist bodies, and the line of demarcation is visible, and testimony to sustain their respective claims to evangelical truth must be drawn from one or the other of these bodies. Reason says, *not* from our own, but from the adverse. I have been amused, however, while examining the course pursued by our pedobaptist brethren; they never quote Baptist evidence to prove that pouring and sprinkling are baptism, and infants the subjects; and for the best of reasons: they can find no such concessions. The testimony which they urge, is the faith and practice of Roman Catholics and modern pedobaptists; but while they present me with nothing but pedobaptist evidence, they only prove to me that their cause is indefensible. In proving that be-

lievers are the only subjects, and immersion the only action of Christian baptism, we design not to introduce one modern Baptist evidence. We will accept of no testimony, but Divine revelation, and the most popular pedobaptists. If these show the Baptists to be right, and *exclusively* right, I shall rest satisfied. Should we appear with *self-interested* testimony, we must fail at every impartial tribunal; but if we present ample evidence from the Scriptures, and from the adverse body, we must secure our claims, or impeach the judge. No man is compelled to bear testimony against himself; but when men, free from duress, make concessions in favor of truth, we can not pass it in silence, and do justice to the cause we sustain.

Replying to any individual pedobaptist, is a matter of secondary importance; for when we have done with one, a second appears, with not only a new, but an opposite theory. This is evident from the two last productions of this city; and if the one that follows this is not different from both the preceding, I shall think the laws of motion in the pedobaptist world are reversed. When the Savior was on earth, the Scribes and Pharisees took two methods to put down his doctrine: 1st, they charged him with teaching and practicing contrary to the law of God; 2d, being stung with his truth, which they could not answer, they resorted to *ridicule*. Had they convicted him of the first, *his* cause would have suffered; but their practice of the second did but injure *their own*. The ignorance of *that* age was an apology for them; but the light of *this*, demands sound argument.

Much has been said about brotherly love, charity, and Christian union. The substance of these is a heaven-born treasure; but their shadow is a mere illusion. Should Christians and ministers act kindly toward each other, by frequently exchanging pulpits, and entering into a work of revival in a neighboring

sanctuary as they would in their own, irrespective of denominational differences,—having the glory of God and the salvation of souls for their motive; their *practice* would go further to promote Christian union, and remove stumbling-blocks from the path of the unconverted, than many pompous sermons on Christian charity, without such example.

I. ROBORDS.

New Haven, August, 1838.

THE CONVERT'S GUIDE.

CHAPTER I.

SECTION I.

A Brief Review of "A CRITICAL DISSERTATION on the Scriptural Mode of Baptism, proving the Exclusive Divine Authority of Affusion and Sprinkling. By LEICESTER A. SAWYER."

I wish it distinctly understood, that I undertake this review at the request of Mr. Sawyer.

Mr. Sawyer says, p. 1, "There is a scriptural mode of baptism, which is capable of being *fully* ascertained and *triumphantly* established. It can not for a moment be supposed that this matter is left in impenetrable darkness. Such a supposition is inconsistent with the perfection of the word of God as a rule of action, and ANNIHILATES the institution of baptism itself, in as much as we can not be bound to do what we can not learn how to do."

This statement is truth in its native simplicity; and the God of truth on earth and at the last judgment will show it to be such.

1. The testimony of the Lord.

"The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul; the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple."—*Psalm* xix. 7.

2. The testimony of the apostles.

"All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and

is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."—2 *Tim.* iii. 16, 17.

3. The testimony of pedobaptists.

"The Supreme Judge, by whom all controversies of religion are to be determined, and all decrees of Councils, opinions of ancient writers, doctrines of men, and private spirits, are to be examined, and in whose sentence we are to rest, can be no other but the Holy Spirit speaking in the Scriptures. Matt. xxii. 29—31."—*Presbyterian Confession of Faith, Chap. 1, Sec. 10.*

"We ought not to worship God with any other *external worship* than what himself has commanded and appointed us in his holy word. The Scripture has set us our bounds for worship, to which we must not add, and from which we ought not to diminish; for whosoever does either the one or the other, must needs accuse the rule either in defect of things necessary, or of superfluity in things unnecessary, which is an *high affront* to the wisdom of God, who, as he is the object of all worship, so he is the prescriber of all that worship which he will accept and reward."—*Bishop Hopkins' Works, p. 107.*

But notwithstanding this, some men positively deny what Mr. Sawyer says above: yes, Mr. S. himself palpably contradicts it before he gets through; for on p. 19 he says, "As no specific directions are given in the New Testament respecting the *mode* of baptism the early Christians, like many in modern times, may have thought themselves at liberty to baptize in what *mode* they pleased." Again, he says in his second pamphlet, p. 20, "The mere *mode* of administering established rites, where the directions respecting the *mode* are not supposed to be specific."

Such gross mistakes are not the fruit of ignorance, for Mr. S. is a man of erudition; but it is the legiti-

mate result of attempting to run between the commands of God and human institutions. He sometimes falls in with one, and then with the other. Now God either has made a revelation of his will to us, or he has not: if he has not, then we are wholly without a guide; if he has, then the Bible is his will and our guide. If the Bible is his will respecting our duty, then it is complete, or it is not: if it is complete, then our duty is clearly expressed. If it is not complete, then it is so because God would not, or could not, make it complete: but to say that he could not, limits omnipotence; and to say he would not, impeaches his goodness. The conclusion is evident, the Bible is a full and complete rule of faith and practice.

SECTION II.

THE next position of Mr. Sawyer's which I shall notice, is that in order to establish his doctrine, he denies the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures; charges the Greeks, as a nation and a church, with not understanding their own language; the apostles and primitive church with ignorance and error; and the translators of our English version with error and want of ability to accomplish in their whole effort even as much as he has done in his little book of 24 pages.

1. He denies the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures. On p. 2 he says, "The English verb baptize corresponds to the Greek βαπτίζω, from which it is derived. The noun baptism corresponds to the Greek βαπτισμα and βαπτισμος, both of which are applied to denote the rite of baptism in the New Testament.—The language of the Septuagint is Hebraistic, not strictly classic; that is, it differs from the language used by native Greek writers, by being, in many instances and particulars, conformed to the Hebrew, of which it is a

translation, and by being used to express ideas and denote objects unknown to Grecian literature." On p. 3 he says, "*βαπτίζω*, as used by the classic Greek writers, signifies to dip, to immerse in a liquid." On p. 8 he says, "In adopting the Greek language, and applying it to describe their own peculiar institutions, it was not *possible* for the Jews to use all the words of that language in senses previously established by Grecian usage."

Thus Mr. S. argues through his whole book, to prove that the writers of the New Testament, either from choice, or ignorantly, or for want of language, did adopt and use a classic Greek word, the meaning of which is universally known to be *DIP*, while they by using this word intended to teach the whole church of God to sprinkle. Now Mr. S. has proved his point, or he has not. If he has *not* proved that Christ and the apostles were all mistaken in the use of the word *βαπτίζω*, then his whole scheme is gone at a dash; for he concedes that the legitimate meaning of that word is *dip*. But if he has established the point that the writers of the New Testament fell into the same error with which he charges the translators of the Septuagint, then it is obvious that he denies the inspiration of their writings. Mr. S. would make us believe, that he is only arguing the difference between classic and Hebraistic Greek, while he evidently aims to fix on the mind of the reader, that the language of the Scriptures was not inspired. What if the translators of the Septuagint before Christ's incarnation mistook? and what if the translators of the English version were mistaken? If Christ and his apostles are correct in their use of the word *βαπτίζω* and its cognates, this is all we wish to know. The distinction between classic and Hebraistic Greek has nothing to do with this argument. The question that Mr. S. has introduced is concerning plenary inspiration; that is, were the words

as well as the sentiments of the Bible dictated by the Holy Spirit? or were the apostles and the whole primitive church left to use a classic Greek word, calculated to mislead themselves, and the churches in succeeding ages? On this important point we need light.

1. The testimony of our Lord.

“And Moses wrote all the *words* of the Lord.”—*Exodus* xxiv. 4. “I have also *spoken* by the prophets.”—*Hosea* xii. 10. “For he whom God hath sent speaketh the words of God.”—*John* iii. 34. See also *Deut.* xxxi. 12: *Prov.* i. 23, &c. &c.

2. The testimony of the apostles.

“For I testify to every one that heareth the *words* of the prophecy of this book;—and if any man shall take away from the *words* of the book of this prophecy.”—*Rev.* xxii. 18, 19. “Which things also we speak, not in the *words* which man’s wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth.”—*1 Cor.* ii. 13. “Take ye no thought how or what thing ye shall answer, or what ye shall say; for the Holy Ghost shall teach you in the same hour what ye ought to say.”—*Luke* xii. 11, 12. See also *Acts* v. 20: *John* xvii. 14: *Rev.* i. 3: xxii. 18: xxi. 5: *Heb.* iv. 12.

3. The testimony of pedobaptists.

“And this is the most literal, and no doubt the most correct, rendering of *πολλα ῥηματα*, the Greek *words* which were *dictated* by the Holy Ghost.”—*Evangel. Mag., Hartford, Ct., June, 1836.*

“In the text we are presented, among other things, with a commission given to the apostles and others, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature; he that believeth and βαπτισθεις, (is baptized,) &c. Their preaching therefore was a business of mere delegation; or in other words, Christ preached the gospel by their instrumentality.—Can he who came to publish the will of God to mankind concerning this immensely important subject have left it to be

chiefly published under his authority, by the mere force of human memory, and mixed with human frailty and human opinions, and thus necessarily have become a mass of truth and falsehood, so blended that those who read their writings could never be able to separate the falsehood from the truth? Does any human legislature suffer its own laws to be published in such a manner? Was Christ possessed of less wisdom, or less integrity, or less benevolence, than human legislators?—The same truth is evident, from the promise given to the apostles by our Savior in his last discourse, of the descent of the Holy Ghost.—That he (the Holy Ghost) should bring up to the full view of the memory the things which Christ had taught them. It will be evident to the slightest attention, that the things here promised contain whatever is involved in the *plenary inspiration* of the apostles. If it was fulfilled, then the apostles wrote and preached the gospel under the plenary inspiration of the Holy Ghost, because the promise assures them of such inspiration, in the amplest terms conceivable. If it was not fulfilled, then *Christ was a false prophet*.—The apostles testify directly, that the gospel which they preached was revealed to them from God, ‘which things also we speak not in the *words* which man’s wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth, comparing spiritual things with spiritual;’ or as the last phrase is rendered by Dr. Macknight, explaining spiritual things in spiritual words.”—*Dwight’s Theology, Sermon 48.*

“But God has given us his word to this very end, that it may be our rule; and therefore he has so ordered it that it may be *understood by us*; and strictly speaking this is our only rule. If we join any thing to it, as making it our rule, we do that which we have no warrant for; yea, that which God has forbidden. Deut. iv. 2; Prov. xxx. 6.”—*Pres’t Edwards, vol. 4, p. 482.*

Should Mr. Sawyer read Pres't Edwards' works, vol. 1, from p. 128 to 341, I think it would relieve him from his present embarrassment.

I close this head, by quoting Mr. Dick :

"It is manifest, with respect to many passages of Scripture, that the subjects of which they treat must have been directly revealed to the writers. They could not have been known by any natural means, nor was the knowledge of them attainable by a simple elevation of the faculties. With the faculties of an angel we could not discover the purposes of the Divine mind. In fact, by denying that they were constantly under infallible guidance, it leaves us utterly at a loss to know when we should or should not believe them. If they could blend their own stories with the revelations made to them, how can I be certain that they have not, on some occasions, published, in the name of God, sentiments of their own, to which they were desirous to gain credit and authority? Who will assure me of their perfect fidelity in drawing a line of distinction between the divine and the human parts of their writings? The denial of the plenary inspiration of the Scripture tends to unsettle the foundations of our faith, involves us in doubt and perplexity, and leaves us no other method of ascertaining how much we should believe, but by an appeal to reason. But when reason is invested with the authority of a judge, not only is revelation dishonored, and its author insulted, but the end for which it was given is completely defeated. No man could write an intelligible discourse on a subject which he does not understand, unless he were furnished with the words as well as the sentiments; and that the penmen of the Scriptures did not always understand what they wrote, is intimated by Peter, when he says, that the prophets 'inquired and searched diligently what, and what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did

signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow.' 1 Pet. i. 10, 11. And in another place, having observed that 'eye had not seen, nor ear heard, neither had entered into the heart of man the things which God had prepared for them that love him,' he adds, 'But God hath *revealed* them unto us by his Spirit.' See Rev. i. 1 : Gal. i. 12 : Eph. ii. 5 : 1 Cor. ii. 9, 10. Paul affirms that he and the other apostles spoke 'not in the *words* which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost taught,' 1 Cor. ii. 13 ; and this general assertion may be applied to their writings as well as to their sermons. Besides, every person who hath reflected upon the subject, is aware of the importance of a proper selection of words in expressing our sentiments ; and knows how easy it is for a heedless or unskillful person not only to injure the beauty and weaken the efficacy of a discourse by the impropriety of his language, but by *substituting* one word for another, to which it seems to be equivalent, to alter the meaning, and perhaps render it totally different. If, then, the sacred writers had not been directed in the *choice of words*, how could we have been assured that those which they have chosen were the most proper ? Is it not possible, nay, is it not certain, that they would have sometimes expressed themselves inaccurately, as many of them were illiterate ; and by consequence would have obscured and misrepresented the truth ? In this case, how could our faith have securely rested on their testimony ? Would not the suspicion of error in their writings have rendered it necessary, before we received them, to try them by the standard of reason ? and would not the authority and the design of revelation have thus been overthrown ? We must conclude, therefore, that the words of Scripture are from God, as well as the matter ; or we shall charge him with a want of wisdom in transmitting his truths through a

channel by which they might have been, and most probably have been, polluted."

In view of the above, it is not only the inspired writers who stand charged with the use of misguiding classic Greek words; but the Holy Spirit also. However, the holy apostles and primitive church having been led astray by the use of this word, it is reasonable to suppose that they should wish to retract; and in view of the *entire absence* of any thing of the kind, we will suppose a confession:

Whereas it has recently come to our knowledge, that a little handful of people, calling themselves Baptists, who, under a pretense of keeping our Savior's law, following our example, and keeping the ordinances as we delivered them to the primitive churches, do constantly affirm that the word βαπτίζω does mean to immerse, and that our practice did conform to this use of the word,—therefore urging that sprinkling is not baptism; *and whereas* these Baptists have been supposed to cause much trouble and dispute on earth, and probably will cause still more, unless there is a new revelation on this point:—**Now know therefore**, that we, the sacred penmen, do freely *confess*, that we have been the sole cause of all this trouble. It was not designed by us, but was purely a *mistake*. At the time we wrote the Scriptures, we were ignorant Jews, and did not understand the Greek of the age; besides this, we had before us the Septuagint, a Greek translation of the Hebrew text, which used the word βαπτίζω with reference to the Jewish washings; and we being familiar with that, and yet wholly ignorant of the true use of the Greek language, and being left to our own judgment as to the choice of words in communicating what the Holy Spirit taught us, we did fall into the *mistake* of using the word βαπτίζω (immerse) instead of the word Παρτιζω (sprinkle,) and even went so far as to submit to immersion ourselves, (which

fully proves our honesty in this matter.) The primitive church, following our example, were immersed also; and the *Greeks*, who were a very ignorant and stupid race, understanding only the classic use of their own language, fell into this error, and finally the whole church for about 1300 years. But in as much as sprinkling has made its appearance, and disturbed the churches in the western part of your world for about three or four hundred years, [see Mr. S., first page,] and as the world is getting wiser and still wiser, and especially as a certain Rev. Mr. ——— has recently outstripped all others, going beyond *Lexicons, Translators, Councils*, and the judgment of the whole church for century upon century past, and a large majority of the church at the present day, diving into the very bowels of the divinely inspired original, [see p. 21 of Mr. S.] and found out and triumphantly established the truth; [see his first page;] therefore we stand fully *convicted*, and do herewith send orders, that the word *Βαπτίζω* (immerse) be removed from the New Testament, and the word *Πάντιζω* (sprinkle) take its place. This, with FIVE other alterations suggested by Mr. S., [pamphlet, p. 18,] will correct the whole, and henceforward prove that immersion is a mere nullity.

[Signed, &c.]

2. On p. 19, Mr. S. sets aside the judgment of the first Christian churches after this manner: "Most of the early Christians were unacquainted with the Hebraistic Greek dialect, being familiar with the usage of the classic; and being in a great measure ignorant of that which prevailed among the Jews, the great mass of the ancient Christians would easily have fallen into error on this subject, and have understood the Scriptures as teaching immersion, where they really taught sprinkling; besides, most of them were illiterate," &c. Poor church! you are set aside, en masse.

3. On p. 21, Mr. S. overthrows the judgment of the

whole Greek church, without ceremony. "The same remarks apply to the immersions of the Greek church. The native Greeks, and others who derive their knowledge of the Greek language from the classics and from native Greek usage, have in *every age* been liable to *err* in the interpretation of the Greek Scriptures." POOR GREEKS!

4. On p. 21, he says, "Some are unwilling to look beyond the common English version of the Scriptures, for information on religious subjects, which, however faithful and correct in the main, is confessedly *imperfect* and inadequate in many particulars. It is especially so in relation to the *mode* of baptism, as has been *demonstrated* in the foregoing pages." POOR TRANSLATORS! what a pity they had not the light of Mr. Sawyer's pamphlet to guide them.

But why does Mr. S. condemn Lexicons, the Septuagint, the judgment and practice of the apostles, and of the whole Greek church and nation, all the primitive Christians, and all the translators? The true answer is, because he finds them all opposed to his views.

It is a well known fact, that the Greek language is the most copious and eloquent in the world; and it was the special design of God that this should be the language by which the sacred oracles should be published.

"Homer watered the tongue, and in succeeding ages it flourished till it grew ripe in the New Testament. As Athens in old times was called the Grecia of Grecia, so the New Testament may be styled the Greek of Greek."—*I. Lightfoot, D. D. vol. 1, p. 1015.*

"As to that doubtfulness that some have taken up about the original tongue of this epistle, (i. e. to the Hebrews,) as thinking it strange that he (Paul) should write in the Greek tongue to the Hebrews, especially to the Hebrews of Judea, we need no better satisfaction than what the Hebrews themselves, yea, the Hebrews

of Judea give us ; I mean the Jerusalem Gemarists, from several passages that they have about the Greek language. In Megillah, fol. 71, col. 2, they say thus : ' There is a tradition from Ben Kaphra, God shall enlarge Japhet, and shall dwell in the tents of Sem.' The Babylonian Gemara, on the same treatise, fol. 9, col. 2, resolves us what tongue of Japhet is meant ; for having all along before spoken of the excellency and dignity of the Greek tongue, Rabbi Jonathan of Beth Gubrin saith there are four languages brave for the world to use, viz: the *Vulgar*, the *Roman*, the *Syrian*, and the *Hebrew*. Now the question is, what tongue he means by the *Vulgar*. Reason will name the Greek ; and Midras Tillin makes it plain, for fol. 25, col. 4, speaking of this very passage, he nameth the Greek. Observe then, that the Hebrews call the Greek the *Vulgar* tongue. They proceed, fol. 25, col. 3: It is a tradition, Simeon Ben Gamaliel saith, in books they permitted not that they should write but only in the Greek ; they searched and found that *the law be interpreted completely but only in the Greek*. And the same Talmud, in Sotah, fol. 21, col. 2, hath this record : Rabbi Levi went to Cesarea, and heard them rehearsing their phylacteries in the Greek language ; a passage very well worth observing ; for in Cesarea were as learned schools as any in the nation, and if the phylacteries, (picked sentences out of the law,) which might above all things have challenged their rehearsal in the Hebrew tongue, as their own writers show, yet they say *them* over in Greek,—Paul might very well write to the Hebrews in Judea in the Greek tongue, when that tongue was in so common use even in the university of Judea itself. We should consider how that tongue (i. e. the Hebrew) was now a stranger to all but scholars, (yes, as much as it is to us at this day,) and how God in his providence had dispersed and planted the Greek tongue throughout all the world,

by the conquest of Alexander, (331 years before Christ,) and had brought the Old Testament into Greek.”—*ib.* vol. 1, p. 340.

Thus we find that although the Savior, the apostles, and the members of the first church, were Jews in blood, yet they, and all their fathers for more than three hundred years, were Greeks by education; that by law they were obliged to write and teach in the Greek language only; and their learned Rabbi, Simeon Ben Gamaliel, (who lived at the time, and must have known as much about it as Mr. S. does,) searched and found that the *law* was interpreted completely but *only* in the Greek. See with how good a face Mr. S. condemns the Septuagint.

Thus generation after generation had passed by since the Hebrew language was dead, and the Greek in use, in school and out of school, in the public services of the synagogues, and in all the business of life, wherever they had need of language; and yet Mr. S. attempts to show this enlightened community that they were all so *Hebraistic* that they did not understand the Greek language then, as well as he does at the present time,—and ventures to raise his whole superstructure of sprinkling on this one point. Well might the apostle say, “Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ;” Colos. ii. 8; when he was about to teach the truth concerning baptism as at ver. 12: “Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him.”

SECTION III.

In this section I shall briefly review Mr. Sawyer's second pamphlet, named “A Critical Dissertation on

the Ecclesiastical Relations and Privileges of Children, clearly establishing their Scriptural Title to Baptism." Leaving all classical and other minute criticisms to be considered under their respective heads.

I. The singular view that he takes of John's mission and work. Page 1: "John exercised the authority of a prophet duly authorized to modify and *change* the religious institutions of his time;" pp. 1, 2, "of initiating persons into a religious society, of which he was the *founder*, and which professed to receive *his* doctrines and submit to his discipline, as of Divine authority. Those who embraced the doctrines, and submitted to the discipline of John, were entitled to his baptism, as a seal of *their faith in him*."

Upon these assertions of Mr. S. I would remark, that none appears more glaringly anti-scriptural, than that John required the people to believe in *himself*, and baptized them on a profession of such faith. It is obvious to every Sabbath School scholar, that John required the people to believe in Jesus Christ, and be baptized on this condition. Mark i. 1—8: John's preaching and baptizing is called "the beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ." See also Matt. iii. 10—12: Luke iii. 15—20: John i. 19—28, 35—42: Acts xix. 1—7. These passages do not favor Mr. S's new doctrine, but all to the reverse. But lest he should not rest satisfied, I will quote a few pedobaptists.

John i. 22—25. "The right and power of baptizing Jews, and of collecting them by baptism into a *new religion*, was confined to the Messiah and his precursor in establishing his terrestrial monarchy."—*Lightfoot, Rosenmueller, and Kuinoel, in comprehensive comment on the place.*

"Such as professed repentance and made confession of their sins, he (John) baptized with water, charging them to *believe on the Messiah*, who was to be immediately revealed."—*Brown's Bible Dictionary, under John.*

"The beginning of the gospel history of Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, as it is recorded by the evangelist Mark, thus takes its rise from the opening of John's ministry. It was this John that came under the character of the great forerunner of the Messiah, as it is written in the prophets, and particularly in Mal. iii. 1: 'Behold I send my messenger before thy face, O my anointed son, who shall prepare thy way before thee, and as a harbinger appointed to proclaim thy coming,' shall with remarkable solemnity make it the business of his ministry to introduce *thy kingdom*." See also, Isa. xl. 3.—"And while he (John) was thus urging his exhortation, and saying 'repent ye,' he pleaded with them a very *new* and important argument; for, said he, the long expected kingdom of heaven is now approaching, and God is about to appear in an extraordinary manner, to erect that kingdom spoken of by Daniel, ii. 44, and viii. 13, 14, as the kingdom of the God of heaven, which he would set up and give to the Son of man.—Dr. Sykes, in his essay on the truth of the Christian religion, chap. 3, has largely proved that this phrase refers to those texts in Daniel, quoted in the paraphrase. It properly signifies the *gospel dispensation*, in which subjects were to be gathered to God by his Son, and a society formed which was to subsist, first in more imperfect circumstances on earth, but afterwards to appear complete in the world of glory."—*Doddridge's Expositor*, Sec. 15.

"John indeed administered the baptism of repentance, and came to prepare the way of the Lord, telling the people that they should believe in him that was to come after him, that is in *Jesus Christ*, whose servant he (John) professed himself to be, and so much inferior to him as not to be worthy to loose or bear his shoes."—*Doddridge on Acts* xix. 1—7.

"John the Baptist was filled with the Holy Ghost

from his birth ; he was great in the sight of God, and one of the most excellent of men ; yet he was nothing but the voice of a herald to proclaim the Savior's glory, unworthy even to loose the latchet of his shoes. He knew that Jesus was before him as the Eternal Word ; that he would for ever be preferred before him and all creatures, and that he alone could pardon sin or baptize with the Holy Ghost. He thought he could not enough abase himself or exalt the Lord ; he only desired to prepare his way, and manifest him to Israel. Their light is darkness, and their wisdom madness, who exalt themselves and degrade Christ."—*Scott's Comment.*

From the above it is evident that John did not come to set up a dispensation of his own, requiring people to believe in him, and receive his baptism as a seal of such faith. This statement, and that John was duly authorized to modify and change the religious institutions of his time, only prove that Mr. S. knows how to make assertions.

II. I notice the result of his argument.

On pp. 1, 2, Mr. S. says, "that the Mosaic baptisms, which were of daily occurrence, especially so in the age of pharisaical strictness and formality which characterized the cotemporaries of Christ, was the same baptism which John adopted and used for the purpose of initiating persons into the religious society of which he was the founder, and as a seal of their faith in him," (John.) Now I ask was Jesus Christ baptized merely with John's Mosaic pharisaical washing, on condition of *his faith in John*, to make him a member of John's society? Let men of sense judge.

Again, Mr. S. assures us on p. 2, "that the first notice we have of Christian baptism is at John iii. 22," long after Christ had been baptized of John ; and on p. 3 he says "that all who believed in *Christ* were

baptized with *his* baptism and thus initiated into his society of professed followers,—and that *nothing can be more certain* than that this was required of them all, as an initiating act.” In view of the above, Jesus Christ never was a member of his own church, otherwise he was an anabaptist, (i. e. twice baptized.) Such, O such, are the reasonings of men who will not anoint their eyes with eye salve that they may see. *Rev.* iii. 18.

III. I close by noticing Mr. S's singular method of sustaining his thesis.

1. He *supposes* that the old Jewish body politic and the church of Christ are one and the same thing, under different dispensations.

2. He takes it for granted that the Mosaic washings and Christian baptism are the same thing, only used for different purposes.

3. He admits on pp. 2, 3, 4, 9, that there is neither precept or example in the New Testament for infant sprinkling.

4. He supposes that infants are to be members of the church of Christ, because they were, as he supposes, of the Jewish body.

5. He therefore *supposes strongly*, that they are to be baptized.

I was amused when running over his “Critical Dissertation,” to see how often Mr. S. employs this kind of proof,—*suppose*, or *take it for granted*, viz: On p. 1 twice, p. 2 three times, p. 3 once, p. 4 once, p. 5 twice, p. 6 once, p. 7 once, p. 8 once, p. 9 twice, p. 10 once, p. 12 once, p. 14 once, p. 15 once, p. 18 once, p. 19 three times, p. 21 once, and pp. 23 and 24 are wholly suppositions. While making this examination I was forcibly reminded of the remark of President Edwards, “The business of an argument is to prove, and not to *suppose* or *take for granted* the very thing which is to be proved.” ‘This *supposing*.

and taking things for granted is a mere *rope of sand*; it never can convince strong, well disciplined minds; they must have more than this, or remain unmoved. Allow me such a string of suppositions, and I can prove the doctrine of *transubstantiation*, or any other point of faith and practice of the Romish church. God says to us distinctly, Jeremiah xxiii. 28, "The prophet that hath a dream, let him tell a dream, and he that hath my word, let him speak my word *faithfully*; what is the chaff to the wheat, saith the Lord?" The following facts will illustrate the fallacy of resting upon such arguments:

In A. D. 1813, Russell Colvin, Jesse Boorn, and Stephen Boorn, lived in Manchester, Vt. Colvin left, and none of his friends knew where he was for years. September, 1819, the two Boorns were arrested for the supposed murder of Colvin. From Oct. 27 to Nov. 1 they were under trial; Judge Doolittle presided; attorneys, L. Sargeant and R. Skinner for the prisoners, and C. Sheldon, States Attorney, for the State.

Evidences. 1. A Mr. Boorn "dreamed that R. Colvin came to his bedside and told him that he had been murdered, and he must follow him, and he would take him to the spot where he was buried."

2. "A little dog dug out of a hollow stump some bones and toe nails, (partly burnt) which were pronounced human."

3. Colvin's ghost appeared to a man and declared that the Boorns killed him, and pointed out the spot where he was buried; the place was an old potatoe hole, where they found a knife, a button, and near by an old hat, all which were proved to be Colvin's."

4. "Jesse Boorn said that Stephen Boorn had confessed to him that he did kill Colvin."

5. "Stephen wrote a full confession that he did kill Colvin, and stated the circumstances at length, and gave it to the sherif."

6. "A person in the jail swore that Stephen made the same confession to him."

7. "Silas Merrill swore to the same."

A jury of twelve (I could name them all) found them guilty. Judge Doolittle sanctioned it, and Judge Chase pronounced the sentence, that they be hung, Jan. 28, 1819. The Vermont Legislature was petitioned to remove or commute the sentence; but they refused at first by 104 against 31, and finally 97 against 42. Dec. 22d, Mr. Whelply, of New Jersey, arrived at Manchester, Vt. with Colvin, affirming that Colvin had lived in Dover, N. J. since 1813. The prisoners were set at liberty, and the day was kept as a jubilee by the whole town. Such was the result of proving murder by *supposed* testimony and dreams. Judges, jury, great lawyers, the Legislature and the whole community were deceived. Such has been the uniform result of attempting to prove *infant sprinkling* from Roman Catholic relics, tied together with a string of inferences and suppositions. Many men—good men and great men—have been and can be led astray by the arguments of the age, while it remains a fact that pedobaptism is as destitute of proof as the murder of Colvin. Isa. viii. 19, 20.

CHAPTER II.

THE COVENANTS.

SECTION I.

ON pp. 18 and 19, Mr. Sawyer has said something of the covenants; but, as usual for pedobaptists, they are only mentioned that an inference may be drawn from them. The word covenant means, first, an agreement between two or more parties, on certain terms; and secondly, a promise made by one party to another. A specimen of the first is that national covenant made with the Jews at Sinai; of the second is at Gen. viii. 21—22: ix. 9—17. The word employed in the Old Testament is ברית—in the New, Διαθήκη, rendered *covenant, law, promise, command*, &c. There are several covenants in the Scriptures: One with Noah, Gen. ix. 8—17; with Abraham, Gen. xvii.; with the whole nation of Israel, Ex. xix.—xxiv.; with Phinehas, Numb. xxv. 10—13; with David, 2 Samuel, vii. 5—29; the covenant of works, Rom. iii. 27; of redemption, Gen. xxii. and Psal. lxxxix. &c.

Pedobaptists say that the Abrahamic covenant and God's covenant with the gospel church is one; that God made but one covenant with Abraham, and circumcision was the seal of it. But the Bible speaks plainly of a plurality of covenants. There is the covenant of God concerning Christ, (as McKnight renders it,) Gal. iii. 13—18, 430 years before the giving of the law, Gen. xii. 1—4; and the covenant of circumcision, made 24 years after that, Gen. xvii.; and the covenant of Horeb, made 406 years after this,—the law of Moses being called a covenant, at Jer. xxxi. 31, 32: Zech. xi. 10—11: Heb. ix. 4. God also speaks definitely of a plurality of covenants, at Rom. ix. 4: Gal. iv. 24: Eph. ii. 12. Here are three covenants, at least. Now we ask, which of these cove-

nants was made 430 years before the giving of the law? for *this is the covenant* by which the blessing of Abraham comes on the Gentiles through CHRIST. Gal. iii. 14. The time here given is of much importance, and is thus computed by Dr. Macknight: "To the birth of Isaac, 25 years, Gen. xxi. 5; to the birth of Jacob, 60 years, for Isaac was 60 years old when Jacob was born, Gen. xxv. 26; Jacob went down into Egypt when he was 130 years old, and according to the Septuagint the Israelites sojourned in Egypt 215 years, for thus they translate Ex. xii. 40. Now the sojourning of the children of Israel in the land of Egypt and in the land of Canaan was 430 years." Now reverse the reckoning. They sojourned in Egypt 215 years: Josephus, book 2, chapt. 15, sec. 2; the age of Jacob when he entered Egypt was 130, Gen. xlvii. 9; from the birth of Jacob to the birth of Isaac 60 years; and from the birth of Isaac to the covenant of circumcision, which was made when Abraham was 99, Gen. xvii. 1, is but one year; for Isaac was born when Abraham was 100, Gen. xxi. 5; making it but 406 years to the covenant of circumcision. The full time of 430 would carry us back just 25 years before the birth of Isaac, making Abraham 75 years old at the time when God made the covenant with him (see Gen. xii. 4) spoken of at Gal. iii. 13—18. Hence the evidence is *conclusive*, that the *covenant of Abraham*, Gal. iii. 13—18, and other places in the New Testament, and the covenant of circumcision, are two distinct things, made 24 years distant from each other, and with reference to different things.

It is manifest that the blessing of which the apostle speaks, Gal. iii. 14, was not by the law of Moses; and it is equally evident it was not by the covenant of circumcision, for the PROMISE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT, which is the blessing named, was *by faith* to the gentiles, just as it was given to Abraham. Rom. iii. 26—

31: iv. 4—14. And that covenant being confirmed of God concerning Christ, 430 years before the covenant of Sinai, and revealed to Abraham 24 years before the covenant of circumcision, is equally distinct and independent of both; for the prominent blessing in Gen. xii. is of blessing all nations in Christ the seed of Abraham; and the distinguishing characteristics of the covenant, Gen. xvii., are the inheritance of Canaan and the multiplying of Abraham's posterity. Circumcision was not attached to the promise, Gen. xii., but to that in the 17th chapter, 24 years afterward. This covenant concerning Christ was afterward confirmed with an oath, Gen. xxii. 16—18. See also Heb. vi. 16—18.

Eight years after the covenant at Gen. xii., God made another covenant with Abraham, Gen. xv., respecting the land of Canaan. Sixteen years after this, Gen. xvii., he made another covenant, called by Stephen, Acts vii. 8, the covenant of circumcision. And yet we are gravely told, that there was but one covenant made with Abraham,—that circumcision was the seal of it,—that this covenant and the covenant of grace is the same covenant, under different dispensations, with the form of the seal changed to baptism. Admit, for the sake of argument, all of this, and then inquire what were the promises of the Abrahamic covenant?

1. "I will make thee a great nation." 2. "I will bless thee." 3. "I will bless the families of the earth in thy seed." 4. "Unto thy seed have I given this land, from the river of Egypt unto the great river Euphrates." 5. "I will make thee the father of many nations." 6. "I will be a God unto thee, and thy seed after thee." 7. "I will make kings to come out of thee." 8. "Thy seed shall possess the gate of its enemies." 9. "My covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant."

These are the blessings given to Abraham, in the 12th, 15th, 17th and 22d chapters of Genesis. If this is the covenant of Christ's church, then the church, and each individual member of it who receives *baptism* as the *seal of the Abrahamic covenant*, may confidently look for each and all of the above things; for God has sealed them to him, on pedobaptist principles. And if God made but one covenant with Abraham, of which circumcision was the seal, then that which is recorded, Gen. xxii., is a mere *aliquem in numerum aggregare*, forgotten or otherwise neglected when the covenant was sealed and delivered, Gen. xvii., and not added until about 30 years after. Will pedobaptists admit all this, to get proof for infant baptism?

SECTION II.

The Covenant of Redemption.

THIS covenant is brought to view in the following Scriptures: "And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between her seed and thy seed, and it (Hebrew HE) shalt bruise thy head and thou shalt bruise his heel." Gen. iii. 15. "I will bless them that bless thee and curse them that curse thee, and in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed." Gen. xii. 3. "In blessing I will bless thee," &c. Gen. xxii. 17, 18. "Now to Abraham and *his seed* were the promises made; he saith not and to *seeds* as of many, but as of one: and to thy *seed*, which is CHRIST." Gal. iii. 16. Isa. liii. 10—12; Eph. i. 4; Zec. vi. 13; Psal. ii. 6—8. "Thou speakest in vision to thy HOLY ONE and said," &c. Psal. lxxxix. 19—36. From the above Scriptures it is evident that this covenant was made by the persons of the God-head with reference to the salvation of men, and must

have existed eternally. Although it was not made with any man, yet God was pleased to reveal it to Adam, Abraham, David, Isaiah, Zechariah, and all the patriarchs and prophets of old. But the most glorious and full revelation that we find is to David, Psa. ii. 4—8: lxviii. 14—18: lxxxix.: xci. with others. This is *a gracious* covenant, but not THE COVENANT OF GRACE.

SECTION III.

The Covenant of Grace.

THIS covenant is made and exists between God and each Christian; and this being made with a man, *he is in grace and grace in him*. It is brought to view at Gal. i. 6; Eph. i. 7: ii. 5—10; Gen. xii. 1—4; Tit. iii. 7; 1 Cor. i. 4. "Incline your ear and come unto me; hear and your soul shall live; and I will make an everlasting covenant with you, even the sure mercies of David." Isa. lxxv. 3. This class of Scriptures does not refer to the covenant of redemption, for they speak of a covenant made with the man who will incline his ear and hear God. These Scriptures can not refer to the covenant of circumcision, for they are addressed alike to Jew and Gentile. But circumcision was not given to the Gentiles, and the Jews had already been circumcised at eight days old, (See Gen. xvii. 9—14.) and the individual who became interested in this covenant was to enjoy the salvation of God. But the covenant of circumcision gave no such promise; therefore, the covenant spoken of in Isaiah lv. 3, was the covenant of grace. This covenant does not exist between God and the unregenerate. Gen. vi. 5: Mat. xv. 19: John viii. 44: Rom. iii. 10—18: viii. 4: Prov. i. 24: Mat. xxv. 46. This view of the subject does not

militate against the salvation of infants. We have no doubt that all who die in infancy are saved. Since the days of Origen, however, there has been much doubt of this. The churches at Alexandria, Rome, and in Africa were led into error on this doctrine, and some denominations in this age are not free from perplexities. "God doth not leave all men to perish in the estate of sin and misery into which they fell by the breach of the first covenant, commonly called the covenant of works, but of his mere love and mercy he delivereth *his elect* out of it. Baptism is *not to be administered to any out of the visible church*, and so strangers to the covenant of promise, till they profess their faith in Christ and obedience to him. But *infants* descending from parents either both or *but one of them* professing faith in Christ and obedience to him, are in that respect *within the covenant*, and are to be baptized." *Presbyterian Confession of Faith*, pp. 156—287. I see no consistency in raising a scheme to save the infants of church members, and not those of persons out of the church. An *infant* is an *infant*, and by nature they are all equal; and I can not believe that the infant child of my neighbor is lost, because its parent is not a member of the church. See Matt. xix. 14. God makes the covenant of grace with each individual at the instant he is regenerated or believes. John iii. 18: vi. 53, 54: Rom. x. 4: iv. 9—13. I can not give an account of all the persons with whom God has made the covenant of grace, but would present a few instances only. "By faith Noah—by faith Abel—by faith Enoch—by faith Abraham, when he was called to go out into a place which he should after receive for an inheritance, obeyed." *Heb.* xi. 4—8. Here the Holy Spirit dates the particular time when Abraham exercised faith and began to obey God. This faith is the fruit of regeneration, and regeneration is the act by which men are

brought into the covenant of grace with God. It should never be forgotten that the account of Abraham's entering into the covenant of grace is not recorded, as pedobaptists say, at the 12th, 15th, 17th and 22d chapters of Genesis, but at Gen. xii. 1—4. Previous to this he was a pagan, but here he possessed (Rom. iv. 11,) "the righteousness of the faith which he had, *yet being uncircumcised.*" At Isa. lv. 3; God speaks of making the covenant of grace with David, and at 2 Sam. xxiii. 5, David speaks of the same transaction: "Although my house be not so with God, yet he hath made *with me* an *everlasting* covenant, ordered in all things and sure." The strong faith of Abraham, David, Noah, Moses and others, is often spoken of in the New Testament, not that these men could believe for us that we might be saved by proxy, but they are set forth as examples for us. See Mat. iii. 9: Luke xix. 9: Rom. iv. 16: Gal. iii. 6—9. The New Testament saints entered into the covenant of grace for themselves in precisely the same manner that Abraham did at Genesis xii. 1—4. God called; they believed and obeyed, and the work was done.

This view of the subject is fully sustained by what is said at Jer. xxxi. 31—33: "Behold the days come that I will make a *new covenant* with the house of Israel;" and when Paul was urging the Jews to believe on Christ and enter into the covenant of grace, he took this prophecy for his argument. Heb. viii. 7—13.

I have dwelt sufficiently on this to show you that the covenant of grace is a separate and distinct thing from the covenant of redemption and the covenant of circumcision. It is not made with nations, but with individuals. It is not made by proxy, but in person; not with Abraham for all his seed, nor with *gentile parents* for all our *children*, but must be made between God and every soul that enters heaven. John iii. 3. Therefore if you should be taught that it is

needful to have your children baptized in order to bring them into *the Abrahamic covenant of grace*, just ask the teacher to explain himself, and show you if he means that baptizing the infant brings it into the covenant of redemption, which is between the persons of the Godhead, and made with no man; or into the covenant of circumcision, (Gen. xvii. 9—14,) which had no promise of salvation, and belongs *exclusively* to the Jews; or into the covenant of grace made with Abraham, (Gen. xii. 1—4,) and with all other saints at the time of regeneration, and with no others. A few such questions would unravel the *ambiguity* of their teaching, and learn them to talk philosophically.

SECTION IV.

The Covenant of Circumcision.

I. **THIS** covenant is found recorded in the 17th chapter of Genesis. Some of our pedobaptist brethren esteem it the foundation of infant baptism. However, it is a well known fact that some whole churches have renounced infant baptism, other churches are awfully divided, others agree to let each member do as he feels inclined; thus acting on what is called the accommodation plan. But, if the rite is from God, and so vastly important, as they say it is, how can the church license her members to neglect it? There is no middle ground; infant baptism is wrong, or it is right. Many contend that it is right, and say that it had its origin in this covenant. Therefore, we will review the argument.

II. *The Covenants of Grace and Circumcision not the same.*—The Presbyterian Confession of Faith, after extolling the Abrahamic covenant, page 38, says, "There are not, therefore, two covenants of grace, differing in substance, but one and the same, under

different dispensations." I cheerfully admit that the covenant of grace existed in Abraham's day. Hence the apostle says, "The Scriptures, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the *gospel unto Abraham*, saying, In thee shall all the nations of the earth be blessed. *Gal. iii. 8.* But I positively deny its being the same as the covenant of circumcision. A man may be under two or more sets of law at the same time. As a citizen of New Haven, I am under its corporation laws. At the same time I am under the laws of this State, of the United States, and the laws of God; but who will say, therefore, that these laws are one? Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, David, Isaiah and Daniel were in the covenant of grace. They were also in the covenant of circumcision, but this does not prove these covenants one. Christ, the evangelists and apostles were in the covenant of circumcision, and at the same time in the gospel. This does not prove them both the same. The fact is that the covenants of grace and circumcision are as distinct as the gospel and the law of Moses. The Jews attempted to identify them, but Paul labored to keep a line of demarcation plain between them, while writing to the Hebrews, Romans, Galatians and others. See *Gal. v. 2—6: 1 Cor. vii. 19: Rom. iv. 9, 10: iii. 1, 2: ii. 25: Acts xvi. 1—3: Col. iii. 11: 1 Cor. vii. 18.*

Circumcision was a national mark; and a man might be in the covenant of grace and be circumcised, or he might be circumcised and not be in the covenant of grace; for they are not only *separable*, but in fact never were identified, although they might meet in the same subject.

Wm. F. Hamilton says: "Nor is this covenant the same as the covenant of grace; i. e. it does not convey a promise of salvation to Abraham and the specified seed, in this covenant, nor to either of them. Of

this covenant circumcision was the original seal. Now we all know that to whomsoever any covenant or contract is sealed, that seal actually secures to him the full benefit of all the stipulations contained in that covenant. If, then, this covenant be the same as the covenant of grace, since circumcision *was God's seal*, not man's, then every circumcised person must have been INFALLIBLY sure of salvation. The ancient Jews held this opinion, but the language of Christ and the apostles has taught us differently."—*Anabaptism Disproved*, p. 19.

III. *The Subjects of Circumcision*.—"And ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin." Gen. xvii. 11. This makes it binding on Abraham, and no other. Hence the law has to be enlarged: "Every man child in your generation." ver. 12. Here is authority to circumcise his children. "He that is born in thy house or bought with thy money." This opens a larger door; for (Gen. xiv. 14,) Abraham had three hundred and eighteen soldiers, able to bear arms, all born in his house. And, from this time forward, he was to circumcise all others who were thus born or bought. This is the extent of the law; and, whether they were *saints* or *infidels*, if they sustained the above relations they must be circumcised. In the apostolic age there were some Judaizing teachers who fell into the same mistake which modern pedobaptists entertain; i. e. that being circumcised was making a profession of religion, and that the gentiles as well as the Jews were bound to attend to it. In the 15th chapter of Acts, we are informed that Paul and Barnabas brought tidings to Jerusalem that many of the gentiles were converted: verses 5, 6, "There arose up certain of the sect of the pharisees who believed, saying that it was needful to circumcise them and command them to keep the law of Moses; and the apostles came together to consider this matter." After de-

liberation upon the question, they came to this result ; (verses 28, 29,) " For it seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us, to lay upon you (gentile converts,) no greater burden than these necessary things: that ye abstain from meats offered to idols; from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication: From which if ye keep yourselves, ye shall do well. Fare ye well." They arrived at this conclusion because circumcision was never binding on the gentiles, and because to the Jews it was never abrogated. For Christ was circumcised ; (Luke ii. 21,) and all the Jews, whether believers or infidels, continued the practice : " This, therefore, is what Herodotus saith, that the Syrians which are in Palestine are circumcised, but there are no inhabitants of Palestine circumcised excepting the Jews.—*Josephus against Apion, book 1, sec. 22.*

IV. *Is circumcision the same to all who receive it that it was to Abraham?*—I wish to consider this question, because pedobaptists say that " circumcision, and baptism its substitute, is the seal of the covenant of grace ; it was so to Abraham, and is so to all who receive it ;" and to sustain themselves quote Rom. iv. 11 : " And he received THE sign of circumcision ; a seal of the righteousness of HIS faith which he had *yet being uncircumcised.*" But it is evident that circumcision or baptism could not be a seal of the righteousness of the faith of an infant eight days old. The gentile proselyte could not claim the promises made to Abraham, Gen. xvii. 6 : " I will make thee exceeding fruitful, and will make nations of thee, and kings shall come out of thee." But he could claim, Gen. xvii. 8 : " I will give unto thee and unto thy seed after thee, the land," &c., which Abraham could not claim, Acts vii. 5 : " And he gave him (Abraham) no inheritance in it ; no, not so much as to set his foot on." See Gen. xxiii. 4—20.

MR. COWLES says, "That which St. Paul meant by calling circumcision the seal of the righteousness of his faith, is simply this: That the promptitude and cheerfulness with which he received and obeyed this self-denying duty was a seal, or token, or confirming evidence of the sincerity of his faith."

"It appears to be conceded by pedobaptists, that there were peculiarities belonging to the covenant with Abraham, although it be considered as the covenant of grace, and that it is not made *with other believers in the same form*, or to the same extent. Indeed, this is too obvious to be denied. But these *peculiar items* are called *appendages* to the covenant of grace, i. e. something *added* or *annexed* to it.

"But this notion is manifestly without a foundation. They were not appendages to the *Abrahamic* covenant, but *component* and *essential* parts of it, as much so as *any item* of *any* covenant, or will, or deed, *whatever, belongs to the instrument itself*, and *distinguishes* it from *all other* covenants, wills or deeds.

"This covenant, therefore, when properly analyzed and defined, does not contain any premises from which the baptism of believers can be justly inferred, in as much as Abraham's case was peculiar, and the same covenant is not made with *other* believers, especially with *gentile* believers; and in as much as baptism, provided it be designed to answer *any* of the ends of circumcision, cannot be pretended to answer *all* of them; nor can it be considered as a *seal* of the *same* covenant."—*J. Chadwick's Essay on Baptism*, page 110.

V. *The Design of Circumcision.*—

1. Circumcision was designed for a bond of union, to keep the Jews separate from other nations, Gen. xxxiv. 14: "We can not do this thing, to give our sister to one that is uncircumcised." Deut. vii. 3:

"Neither shalt thou make marriages with them." Ezra ix. 1, 2: Acts x. 28.

2. And as a consequence that Christ should come of the seed of Abraham. Gen. xxii. 17, 18: Gal. iii. 16: Heb. ii. 16.

3. To point them to the virtue of his blood and the necessity of regeneration. Deut. x. 16: Jer. iv. 4: Rom. ii. 29: Col. ii. 11.

4. To keep them from idolatry, Gen. xvii. 7: "I will be a God unto thee and to thy seed after thee." Ex. xxxiv. 14: "For thou shalt worship no other God."

5. That they should keep the oracles of God. Rom. iii. 1, 2: Deut. iv. 7, 8: Ps. lxxviii. 5: Eph. ii. 12.

6. To give them an everlasting title to the land of Canaan. Gen. xvii. 8. "And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan; for an everlasting possession."

As God here made *an everlasting covenant-deed of conveyance* of this land to Abraham and his seed, he sealed it with *an everlasting seal* or token, and I have no evidence that Abraham, or God himself, has ever made any other conveyance of that land. It is true that the Romans overcame the Jews, and possessed it by force; but the face of the *DEED*, and the token or *SEAL*, stand immutable. Gen. xvii. The Jews are thrown out of the use of it by rebellion, (Deut. iv. 27: xxviii. 25—64: Jer. iv. 11—18: xviii. 16, 17,) but still they continue to circumcise all their males; and it is right they should, for if they neglect this, they lose the title to their land. Gen. xvii. 14. "The uncircumcised man child, whose flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised, that soul shall be cut off (not from his God, but) from his people; he hath broken my covenant."

Hence all who are circumcised are in this covenant with God, whether *believer* or *infidel*; and we look

for the time when he will bring them to possess Palestine again. Dr. ELY completely demonstrated this fact, in his production respecting the Jews; and the word of God is full on this point. I do not now refer to those prophecies which speak of the Jews' return from the Babylonish captivity; but to those which speak of things which *have never been*, and therefore *remain to be fulfilled to the Jews*. See Ezek. xi. 17—20: xvi. 61: xxxvi. 21—28: Jer. xxxi. 34: Heb. viii. 6—13: Ezek. xx. 37—44: Micah vii. 15—20: Rom. xi. 25—27: 2 Cor. iii. 15, 16: Heb. x. 15—17. This class of Scriptures speak of the Jews *all* being converted to Christ, and dwelling, in the peaceable enjoyment of the Christian religion, in Palestine. This was not their condition when they returned from Babylon, nor has it been at any other time; it remains yet to be accomplished. But to whom are these promises made? Not to the uncircumcised Jew; for he has broken the covenant; Gen. xvii. 14; but *exclusively* to the circumcised. But is it a fact, that baptism will entitle them to their land, and all the promises of the covenant of circumcision? If so, where is the Scripture to warrant the belief? Some writers, however, to sustain pedobaptism, &c., make it simply a seal of the covenant of, and door of admittance into, the *true church of God*. This glaring anti-scriptural sentiment is advanced by nearly all of them who have written upon baptism. Mr. COWLES says, "Circumcision was the door of admittance into the ancient church.—The same qualifications were required for membership in the Jewish as in the Christian church." —*Essay*, pp. 11, 53.

Mr. SAWYER says, "While circumcision was the initiatory rite of the true church, and seal of subjection to God, it answered the same purpose as the corresponding Christian rite.—Judaism and Christianity therefore are two successive dispensations of the same

religion.—Both the Jewish and Christian churches were constituted of professed believers and professed worshipers of God, and required faith and obedience of all their adult subjects." pp. 14, 17.

Upon the thesis of these gentlemen, this ancient church was organized in Abraham's family, for here began what they call the initiatory rite. But were all who were circumcised such believers as Christ and the apostles described? Did circumcision introduce them to church relation and privileges? Was Ishmael a member of the *true church*? See Gen. xxi. 9: Gal. iv. 28—30. Were the three hundred and eighteen adults who were born in Abraham's house, (Gen. xiv. 14,) and circumcised, (xvii. 27,) admitted to church membership on a profession of evangelical faith? Had the thousands that perished under the wrath of God, (Ex. xxxii. 27, 28: Num. xvi. 35: 2 Sam. xxiv. 15: 2 Chron. xiii. 17,) received *JEHOVAH's seal of the immutable covenant of grace*? Were the Jews who murdered the Lord, and were not the children of Abraham, but of the devil, (John viii. 25—59,) all members of the same church with Christ and his apostles? See Mr. S., p. 14.

Without a particle of evidence to sustain themselves, these gentlemen assert the above for truth; but the truth is, circumcision is not a door into the church, nor was it at any former period; and if Abraham's family were organized as a church, there appears but one believer to three hundred and eighteen unconverted men. If this is the model after which Presbyterian churches are built, it accounts for the present condition of their General Assembly, but is wholly unlike their refusing to baptize their slaves and other domestics.

VI. *Is circumcision abrogated?*

1. Testimony of the Lord. "I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after

thee, in their generations, for an *everlasting covenant*." Gen. xvii. 7. "Thou shalt keep my covenant, therefore, thou and thy seed after thee, in ALL their generations." Gen. xvii. 9. See also, Gen. xxvi. 3: 1 Chron. xvi. 15—18.

2. Testimony of the apostles. 1. The apostles declare circumcision indifferent in the Christian religion, which they could not have done if it had been abrogated. "Is any man called, being circumcised, let him not become uncircumcised; is any man called in uncircumcision, let him not be circumcised; *circumcision is nothing*, and *uncircumcision is nothing*, but the keeping of the commandments of God." 1 Cor. vii. 18, 19. See also, Col. iii. 11: Gal. ii. 3—25: v. 6: vi. 12: Rom. iv. 9, 10. If God had not abolished circumcision, the Jews could not have kept his commandments and neglected it; Gen. xvii. 14; and if God had abolished it, they could not have kept his commandments and still practiced it. 2. The Jews advocated its perpetuity. Acts xv. 1. Paul taught that circumcision was still binding. Rom. iii. 1, 2. Converted Jews in the Christian church continued to practice it through the whole New Testament. Jesus Christ was circumcised; Luke ii. 21; HE was a MINISTER of the circumcision. Rom. xv. 8. Paul was circumcised. Phil. iii. 5. Paul circumcised Timothy, *after he had been baptized*. Acts xvi. 3. See also, Rom. iii. 30: Gal. ii. 7, 8: Col. iv. 11. But it is said that Paul forbid circumcision at Gal. v. 2—4. Dr. WARDLAW says, "*If ye be circumcised* Christ shall profit you nothing, is equivalent to saying, *If ye embrace this doctrine* Christ shall profit you nothing. This is clear from the circumstance that being circumcised in the one verse, corresponds to being *justified by the law* in the other."—*Essay on Baptism*, p. 32.

3. It is said that Paul was arraigned and tried for preaching against circumcision. "And they are all

informed of thee, that thou teachest all the Jews which are among the gentiles, to forsake Moses, saying they ought not to circumcise their children." Acts xxi. 21. It is true that Paul was apprehended upon this charge, and brought before the Sanhedrim; but after a full examination, even the Pharisees said, (Acts xxiii. 9,) "we find no fault in this man." Paul did teach that the Jews need not keep the law of Moses, for that was abolished, and that the gentiles need not circumcise their children; (see Acts xxi. 25;) but he did not teach that the Jews need not circumcise their infants, for he knew that this was binding on them by the law of heaven.

The Jews and modern pedobaptists embrace similar errors. The Jews suppose that the covenant of circumcision is identified with their Mosaic religion; and pedobaptists suppose it to be identified with their Christian religion; but it is as independent of the one as the other. The Jews esteem both the covenant of circumcision and the Mosaic covenant, now obligatory; the pedobaptists esteem them both abrogated; while the fact is, the Mosaic covenant is broken and abolished; Jer. xxxi. 31-33: Zech. xi. 10, 11: Heb. viii. 4-13; but the covenant of circumcision is an *everlasting* covenant, (Gen. xvii. 13,) and binding on every male of Abraham's seed to this day.

3. The testimony of pedobaptists.

"The covenant of circumcision, so far from being a part of the law and partaking of its temporary nature, was a covenant which existed long before it, which could not be disannulled either by its introduction or its cessation, but which continues to this day."
—*Dr. Wardlaw on Baptism, p. 28.*

"Besides, as circumcision never was obligatory on the gentiles in their separate national capacity, and *never was abrogated to the Jews*, but remains in full force to them, there can be no ground to consider bap-

tism as a substitute. As the case is, such a thing could not be.—*Chadwick on Baptism*, p. 23.

VII. *Is baptism a substitute for circumcision?* It certainly is not; for as the rite was enjoined upon the Jews and never was abrogated, the original stands, and no substitute is required or can be; and, as *we are not Jews*, but gentiles, we need no substitute for a rite which never belonged to us. There is not a passage in the whole Bible that even hints at this doctrine. It depends alone on pedobaptist assertions for its foundation, and that of the more ignorant and illiterate part; for well read pedobaptists say as follows:

Dr. EMMONS, "Can we, therefore, justly conclude that it is the duty of believers now to circumcise their children or even to baptize them, because it was once the duty of the Jews to circumcise theirs. The truth is, we must learn the particular duties of believers under the present dispensation of the covenant of grace, from the dispensation itself, which enjoins all the peculiar duties which belong to it."

"In every view of the case, therefore, the argument for infant baptism, grounded on the Abrahamic covenant, or any covenant or promise in the Bible, fails, and ought never to be plead."—*Chadwick on Baptism*, p. 128.

Dr. J. OWEN, "No argument can be drawn from the ceremonial law to the gospel, because we are not under the obligation of that law."

"Baptism is a sacrament of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ."—*Presbyterian Confession of Faith*, p. 120.

"Arguments drawn from the types and figures conclude not, unless they be types ordained of God to such use; neither are the *sacraments of the gospel* to be squared according to the patterns of the ceremonial law. We also deny that the ceremonies of the law are figures and types of our sacraments; but both

their sacraments and ours are figures and representations of Christ.”—*Dr. Willet, Synopsis of Papism*, p. 643.

“As God, by virtue of the said engagement with Christ, has made *distinct covenants* with men, although they have all *one leading feature*; and as it is manifest from the very instruments themselves, that there is a distinction not only between the new covenant under the gospel and the Sinai covenant, but also between *this* and the *Abrahamic* covenant; it is manifestly not consistent to consider baptism as a substitute for circumcision. It *does not belong* to the *same covenant*, and, therefore, *can not* be a *substitute*. Neither is it appointed for the same ends; certainly not for all of them; which it must have been to make it a proper substitute. Neither are we any where told in the scriptures that it is a substitute. We conclude, therefore, that infant baptism was not known in the days of the apostles, nor the succession of baptism in the place of circumcision.”—*Chadwick on Baptism*, p. 113.

SECTION V.

The Mosaic Covenant.

THE law of Moses is called a covenant. Ex. xxxiv. 28: Lev. xxvi. 15: Dent. iv. 13: xxix. 1. It is important to examine this covenant, as here is the origin and constitution of what Stephen calls τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, translated “the church in the wilderness.” Some pedobaptists say that *their* church originated in Abraham’s family, Gen. xvii., 406 years before the law of Moses; but if making a covenant with God, offering sacrifices, prayers, &c. constitutes a church, then not only Abraham and his family became a church, but we find many such. Noah, who was a preacher of

righteousness, 2 Pet. ii. 5, and offered sacrifices and prayers to God, with all his family, entered into covenant, Gen. ix. 9—17, in which God gave to him and his seed, not simply the land of Canaan, but the whole world, with many other blessings, and the rainbow as a token or seal of that covenant; and not simply promising that he would remove the present possessors, but did remove them at once by an universal flood. Josiah, his family, and the whole nation, entered into covenant. 2 Kings xxiii. 1—30. Asa, his family, and all the nation, entered into covenant. 2 Chron. xv. 8—19. To the covenant with Noah and Abraham, God gave each equally a token or seal. Gen. ix. 12 : xvii. 11. But still, the Mosaic covenanters only are known as the $\epsilon\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\iota\alpha$, or congregation. All Jewish covenants, subsequent to the Mosaic, are but transactions of the Mosaic organization; and all previous covenants and organizations are not only destitute of the name, but of nearly every essential of a church. Abraham's posterity, previous to the Sinai covenant, had no church, no Bible, no Sabbath, no priests or elders, no sanctuary, no baptism, no passover, no singing, no discipline, but simply existed as any other nation does where there are one thousand unregenerate souls to one true child of God; and we could as consistently call the whole French nation the church of God, as the Jews. But when they left Egypt, there was a formal organization of the whole nation into *not* "the church of God," but a *pedobaptist congregation*.

The word $\epsilon\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\iota\alpha$ is formed of $\epsilon\kappa$, out, and $\kappa\alpha\lambda\epsilon\omega$, call,— $\epsilon\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\iota\alpha$, *called out*; hence a *convocation*. In considering the Mosaic church, we notice,

1. They were a people called out (of Egypt) by God himself. Acts xiii. 17 : Ex. vi. 6 : xii. 31 : Deut. iv. 33—35.

2. They were *all baptized*. 1 Cor. x. 1, 2. "All our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed thro'

the sea, and were all baptized unto Moses." Ex. xiv. 21, 22: Num. xxxiii. 8.

(1.) The subjects of baptism, Ex. xii. 37; "Six hundred thousand on foot that were men, besides children." This was pedobaptism, for the congregation consisted of *men, women and children*. Ex. xv. 20: Lev. xxvii. 5: Num. xxx. 3.

(2.) The *mode*; they טָבַל, *dipped* their bodies in water. 2 Kings v. 14. They שָׁפַךְ, *poured* out ashes, Lev. iv. 12, and נָזַף, *sprinkled* with blood Lev. xvi. 14.

3. They had the passover; Ex. xii. 2—27; and as this Jewish pedobaptist church was a type, Col. ii. 17: Heb. viii. 5, of the church of God, Acts xx. 28: 1 Tim. iii. 5, God gave them the passover before their formal organization, as he did the eucharist to the church of God before *its* formal organization. Matt. xxvi. 26—30.

4. They entered into a church covenant with God and each other. Ex. xxiv. 7—8: Gal. iv. 24, 25.

5. They had the oracles of God, or Bible given to them. Luke xxiv. 27: Rom. iii. 2: Ex. xvii. 14: xxiv. 4.

6. God now gave them a sanctuary. Ex. xxv. 8, he commanded it to be made, and xxxix. 40—43: xl. 33—38, it was finished.

7. God gave them priests and elders. Ex. 28, 29.

8. God gave them a Sabbath. Gen. ii. 2, 3, God made a Sabbath for himself; but we have no scriptural evidence that the Jews ever had a Sabbath till in the wilderness, Ex. xvi. 23—25; for Pharaoh knew neither God nor Sabbath, Ex. v. 2, nor did the Jews as a nation till they left Egypt.

9. They received a form of church discipline, and began to practice it. Ex. chapters 20, 21, 22, &c.

10. Here also they began singing; for we have no account of it till at Ex. xv. 21, after they had crossed the Red Sea.

11. The word קָהָל, which Stephen rendered ἐκκλησία,

Acts vii. 38, and King James rendered *church*, is never used with reference to Abraham's posterity, till the Mosaic organization, Ex. xii. 6, prospectively, and Ex. xxix. 10, with reference to the body existing.

12. This Mosaic organization is called the church by our version of the Scriptures, Acts vii. 38. So we are not left to name it; and at Numbers xii. 7, it is called the house of God; and at Heb. iii. 2. it is called the house of *Moses*. Hence this church, house of God, and house of Moses, is all one thing, and its organization agrees with what pedobaptists call a church. See Presbyterian Confession of Faith, p. 347.

13. The religion taught and practiced by the Scribes, Pharisees, and *Judaizing* teachers, in Christ's time, was precisely that of Moses; and Luke xvi. 29—31, father Abraham, from heaven, lays no claim to it, but calls the whole dispensation "*Moses and the prophets*." Mat. xxiii. 2, the Scribes and Pharisees set in [not Abraham's, but] *Moses's seat*. John ix. 28, "we are [not Abraham's, but] *Moses's disciples*." Acts xv. 21, "For Moses of old time hath in every city them that preach *him*." Gal. iii. 24, "Wherefore the *law* is our *Παδευωτης*, *teacher*, or schoolmaster, [to bring us] unto Christ." Rom. ii. 17: ix. 32: John i. 17: vii. 19.

14. Modern pedobaptists, especially presbyterians, say they are the same church with the above, organized under the same covenant, maintaining the same faith and practices, excepting some of the non-essential externals. Therefore, *Judaism* and pedobaptist religion, are two successive dispensations of the same religion.

Testimony of pedobaptists. Mr. COWLES, "The Sinai covenant was the *constitution* of the Jewish church, until the death of Christ."—*Essay on Baptism*, p. 12.

Mr. SAWYER says, "The institution of baptism has existed from the *time of Moses*.—The Mosaic bap-

isms were administered to the *disciples of Moses, including*, till after the crucifixion, *those of John and Christ*.—He (John) did not, however, adopt a rite entirely new, but applied one that *already existed*, and was in high repute among the Jews.—From the fact that children were at that time the subjects of the *Mosaic baptism*.—The promise of the divine favor to those who hear the gospel is equally extensive with that which was made under the *law*.—It [i. e. Mr. Sawyer's pedobaptist church] was organized within the Jewish church, and continued to be a branch of it, &c.—*Judaism and Christianity*, therefore, are two successive dispensations of the *same religion*.—*Critical Dissertation*, pp. 1, 2, 7, 13, 14.

From the above it is obvious that before the covenant of Moses the Jews had no church. Melchisedec was a gentile priest at Salem, Gen. xiv. 18: Heb. vii. 1. Pharaoh had pagan priests, Gen. xlvii. 22. The Midianites had priests, Ex. ii. 16.; but the Jews had no priests, no sanctuary, no oracles, no Sabbath, nor any of the above named essentials of a church, till organized at Sinai. That there were believers scattered among the Jews, is true. And so there were among other nations at the same time, and long before the birth or being of Abraham or the Jews. But what we say is, that God never organized a body of people which he called a church, until the Jews left Egypt. Now remove from the Park-street Church, 1. all her called; 2. her baptism, subjects and modes; 3. her passover, or Lord's supper; 4. her church covenant and articles of faith; 5. her oracles, or Bible; 6. her sanctuary; 7. her priest and elders; 8. her Sabbath; 9. her discipline; 10. her singing; 11. her doctrines and practices, taught by the written word of God; 12. the church; and then how much of a church would Mr. Sawyer have left? *Answer*. Just as much as the Jews had before the *Mosaic covenant*.

CHAPTER III.

THE CHURCH.

SECTION I.

The Church of God.

THE word *church* is not found in the Old Testament, and but once in the New Testament with reference to the Old, Acts vii. 38, "This is he who was in the assembly in the wilderness. I follow Beza Heinsius and the Prussian translators in rendering *ἐκκλησία*, *assembly*, as our translators do, (Acts 19,) because I am persuaded it refers not in the general to their being incorporated into one church, in the appropriate sense of that word, but to their being assembled round the mountain on the solemn day when the law was given. Ex. xix. 17."—*Doddridge's Expos. Note.*

The word *church* is very indefinite without an adjective. Hence we say the brick church, the white church, the Baptist church, the church of England, &c. So with the *ἐκκλησία*, *concio*, &c. of other languages. In the Bible it means 1. simply a convocation of people, of any character, for any purpose, good or bad. Acts vii. 38: xix. 32, 39, 41. 2. When pointed out by the connection of its history, or by adjectives to that effect, it means a number of Christ's disciples, jointly believing and practicing his revealed will, as at Acts xx. 28, "Feed the Church of God." 1 Cor. i. 2: x. 32: xi. 22: xv. 9: Gal. i. 13: 1 Tim. iii. 5: Mat. xvi. 18: Acts ii. 47: Eph. iii. 10: v. 24. 3. In some few instances it refers to all of the redeemed, as at Eph. v. 25—33: Col. i. 18—24: but those theological terms, *church militant*, *church triumphant*, *mystical church*, &c., are not found in the Bible, and only tend to confuse and lead the mind astray. The words kingdom, kingdom of God, king-

dom of heaven, &c., have different meanings. Sometimes they refer to heaven, as at Mat. xiii. 43: Mark x. 14: 1 Cor. xv. 50: and sometimes they mean the church of God, as at Dan. ii. 44: vii. 22: Mat. iii. 2: Luke xii. 32; and at other times they refer to Christ and his disciples on earth, without any reference to their organization as a church, and are thus often used with reference to them before the church of God had its visible organization. Mat. xi. 12: xii. 28: xxiii. 13: Luke xi. 20: xvii. 21.

In further noticing the Church of God, I shall speak,—

1. *Of JESUS CHRIST, the Head, Priest and King.* It is beyond the limits and design of this work to notice the supreme divinity and glorious attributes of our common Savior. I only call your attention to Jesus at this time, to correct one gross error which pedobaptists have published; i. e. that he was a Jewish priest; and was therefore baptized at the age of 30, to induct him into that office; affirming that this was the age at which the *Jewish priests* were set apart to their work. But the Scriptures declare that Jesus Christ was not a Jewish priest, Heb. vii. 11, 12, but a priest after the order of Melchisedec, Heb. v. 6—10. Only three of the sacred penmen speak of Melchisedec, viz: Moses, David and Paul. At Gen. xiv. 18, when Abraham returned from the battle with Chedorlaomer, “Melchisedec, king of Salem, brought forth bread and wine; and he was the priest of the Most High God.” Here we have the time when he lived: *in Abraham’s day*, 1911 before Christ; and his place of residence and temporal office, *king of Salem*; his spiritual office, *priest of the Most High God*.

Thus we find that God had an established priesthood 3700 years since, and at least 420 years before the Aaronic priesthood began. 1490 years before Christ, God established the Jewish priesthood. Aaron

was high priest, and his sons subordinates, Lev. viii. From this time there was a succession of priests and high priests among the Jews. There was also another order of officers called *Levites*, whose duty it was to serve as burden bearers in the tabernacle of the congregation. Num. i. 50—54. They were to begin an apprenticeship at the age of 25 years, Num. viii. 24, and be fully inducted at the age of 30, Num. iv. 23, and continue in office to the age of 50, and no longer. Num. iv. 23: viii. 25. This law belonged *exclusively* to the Levites; for Aaron was made a priest at the age 83, Ex. vii. 7, and officiated till he died at the age of 123. Num. xxxiii. 39.

Thus we could show you from Scripture that *Eleazer*, *Phineas*, and all the priests successively, did not begin at the age of 30, or leave at 50. Hence, those who say that Jesus was baptized at the age of 30 to consecrate him to a Jewish office, make him a *mere Levite*—a servant and burden-bearer of the congregation. While the Aaronic priesthood was in its glory, their royal prophet, David, said, Psa. cx. 4, "The Lord hath sworn and will not repent, thou art a priest forever, after the order of Melchisedec." This is the second place where Melchisedec is spoken of in the Bible, and evidently refers to what Christ should be in his priesthood. The third and last who speaks of Melchisedec is Paul, at Hebrews v. 6—10: vi. 20: vii. 1, 2, 10, 11, 15, 17, 21. Paul's argument in these three chapters is based upon the fact that Jesus Christ was *not* a Jewish priest, but of an order which God established nearly 400 years before Moses or Aaron had birth or being. It is true that our Savior was a Jew, John iv. 22, and attended to all the ceremonies of the Mosaic religion until they were abrogated. But when he entered upon his public ministry he left the Mosaic religion, and was ordained a priest after the order of Melchisedec's gentile priest-

hood, Heb. vii. 11—17; and if he had wished to be a Jewish priest, their law forbade it, for “he sprang out of Judah, of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning the priesthood.” Heb. vii. 14. When he officiated he never clothed himself with their priestly robes. He never officiated in their temple as a priest. He never claimed or received the emoluments of a priest. The Jews would not receive his new kind of religion, but “rejected the counsel of God against themselves, being not baptized” with the same baptism which Christ received. Luke vii. 30. The whole Jewish priesthood opposed him, and he opposed them, and frankly and constantly told them if they did not forsake their religion and embrace his, they would all go to hell. Mat. xxiii. 13—33: Luke xi. 44—49: John viii. 21. Christ was introduced into the priestly office without any of the Levitical ceremonies, but *κατα δυναμιν* (by virtue of) an endless life; and the oath of God. Heb. vii. 16—21. When he had instituted his own religion, which was adapted to the wants of both Jews and Gentiles, he abolished the Jewish priesthood, Jer. xxxi. 32: Zech. xi. 10—14: 2 Cor. iii. 13: Eph. ii. 15, and practiced exclusively his own, which was after the order of Melchisedec, which was as independent of the Mosaic when Christ officiated, as it was in the days of Melchisedec, 400 years before Moses; and this Jesus Christ, who is God’s high priest, was not ordained to offer Jewish sacrifices, but to offer himself as the great *substance* of which the Mosaic sacrifices were but shadows, and has established a new and more excellent ministry, by a new covenant with (not the old Jewish, but) the *church of God*, Heb. viii. 2—13, which is the body of which he is head. Eph. i. 20—23: iv. 15: Col. i. 18.

2. *When was the Church of God set up?*

The Scriptures must determine this. We shall

here notice the prophecies on this point. Compare Deut. xviii. 15, with Acts iii. 22—24, and Psal. ii. 6, 7, with 1 Tim. vi. 15, and Isa. vii. 14, with Mat. i. 22, 23, and Isa. viii. 14—18, with Mat. xi. 25 : xxi. 42—46 : Heb. ii. 11—18, and Isa. x. 21, with Rom. xi. 5, and Isa. xxviii. 16, with Eph. ii. 20—22, and Isa. xl. 11, with John x. 11—16, and Joel ii. 28, with Acts ii. 14—47, and Micah iv. 8, with Acts ii. 39—41 ; but the most conclusive prophecy is at Daniel ii. 44, 45 : ix. 24—27. The passage in the second chapter is an interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar's dream by the inspiration of God. That in the ninth chapter was a vision from heaven, explained by Gabriel. Dan. ix. 21—23.

These passages, as is acknowledged by all the Christian world, point out the time when the Church of God was set up. To give an explanation of them in as few words as possible, we will introduce the views of Dr. Adam Clark. "Dan. ii. 44, "A kingdom which shall never be destroyed. The extensive and extending empire of Christ.—The dream. 1. The head was of fine gold. 2. The breast and arms of silver. 3. The belly and thighs of brass. 4. The legs of iron, and the feet and toes of iron and clay. 5. A stone cut out of the mountain without hands, smites the image. 1. The head of gold. This was the first monarchy, begun by Nimrod, B. C. 2233, and ended with the death of Belshazzar, B. C. 538. 2. The breast and arms of silver. This was the Medo-Persian empire, which properly began under Darius the Mede ; allowing him to be the same with Cyaxares, the son of Astyages, who, by the capture of Babylon, B. C. 538, terminated the Chaldean empire, and on the death of his father, and his uncle Cyaxares, B. C. 536, became sole governor of the Medes and Persians. 3. The belly and thighs of brass, is the Macedonian or Grecian empire, founded by Alexander the Great, B. C. 331. After his death, B. C. 323, the

empire became divided among his generals, Cassander, Lysimachus, Ptolemy Lagus, and Seleucus Nicator. 4. The legs of iron and feet of iron and clay. This means in the first place the kingdom of Lagidai, in Egypt; the kingdom of Seleucus in Syria, and secondly the Roman empire, which was properly composed of them. Ptolemy began his kingdom in Egypt B. C. 312, which continued to B. C. 30. Seleucus began his kingdom of Syria B. C. 312, which continued till B. C. 65. The former was overthrown by Octavius, the latter by Pompey, and these two were absorbed in the Roman government. 5. A stone cut out of the mountain without hands. Christ is often called a stone in the Scriptures; but, this stone has reference to *his church*, which is represented with Christ the rock as its foundation and its top stone. It strikes the feet and not only ruins them, but the *brass*, the *silver* and the *gold*. And this stone itself becomes a great mountain and fills the whole earth."

Dan. ix. 24—27. "Seventy weeks are determined, &c. The above 70 weeks or 490 years, are divided (ver. 25) into three distinct periods; to each of which particular events are assigned. To the first seven weeks, the restoration and repairing of Jerusalem are referred, and so long were Ezra and Nehemiah employed; for this work lasted 49 years after the commission given by Artaxerxes. The second period is 62 weeks or 434 years, at the end of which the prophet says the Messiah should come; making in all, from the time of the going forth of the commandment of Artaxerxes, 483 years. 3. He shall confirm the covenant with many for one week, i. e. seven years. This confirmation of the covenant *must take in the ministry of John the Baptist, with that of our Lord*. comprehending the time of seven years, during the whole of which he might be said to confirm or ratify the covenant with mankind. These seven years ad-

ded to the 483, complete the 490. So the whole prophecy has been fulfilled to the very letter." Now if this prophecy has been fulfilled to the *very letter*, then the kingdom of God *was set up* at the end of these 70 weeks; or when Christ *ceased* to confirm the covenant, which he continued to do to the day of his ascension.

Dr. Scott says, "the Jews unanimously agree, that by the stone, is here meant the Messiah's Kingdom. —The stone was certainly distinct from the image, nay, directly opposite to it, and all its interests; it must mean therefore, the kingdom *set up* by the power of God without the concurrence of human policy or force, and in opposition to all the authority and combined efforts of the princes of this world; (*especially* those of the old Jewish church,) and the kingdom of Christ was evidently intended."

It should ever be remembered, that these prophecies were given while the Jewish church was standing; and Daniel, who was a member of this church, said that the Babylonish golden kingdom, should yield to the Persian silver kingdom, and the Persian, to the Grecian brass kingdom, and the Grecian, to the Roman iron kingdom; and in the days of the Roman iron Caesars, the God of heaven should *set up* a *new* spiritual kingdom, distinct from any that had existed before. But the old Jewish church or kingdom could not be *set up* then, for it had already been set up, and existed 888 years before this prophecy was uttered. But here was a *new kingdom*, a stone cut out of this great iron mountain, without hands, and put in motion by divine power, destined to move, and roll, till it should break in pieces *all other kingdoms*, the old Jewish kingdom or church *not excepted*.

Had the prophet said that the God of heaven would *remodel* the old Jewish church, and given her Chris-

tian ordinances instead of Jewish rites, it would have met pedobaptist philosophy; but as it is, these prophecies are *fatal* to their whole scheme. But prophecies do not cease with the Old Testament, we pass to the New. At Matt. xvi 18, the Lord promises Peter, that at a future time, he would build his *church* on that truth which he confessed; and at Matt. xviii 15—18, the Savior gave his disciples a rule of discipline to be observed after the master of the house had left them. These are the only instances where the word *church* is used in the Bible till at Acts ii. But the word *kingdom*, in the following instances evidently mean the same thing. John the Baptist says, Matt. iii. 2, “the kingdom of heaven is at hand.” Matt. iv. 17, Christ the *great prophet* repeats the same. Matt. x. 7, he taught his apostles to say the same. Now notice the expression; not that the kingdom of God *had come*, but was coming, “*is at hand*.” Matt. xi. 11, John the Baptist, though greater than a prophet, was not in the kingdom of heaven, for that kingdom had not yet been *set up*. Matt. xvi. 18, “upon this rock I *will build* my church.” Therefore it was not yet built. Mark ix. 1, “verily I say unto you that there be some of them that stand here which shall not taste death, till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power.” See also Matt. xvi. 28: Mark i. 15. Thus the great prophet taught his disciples that they had not yet seen the kingdom of God, but it should come in time for some of them to see it before they tasted death. Luke xii. 32, “Fear not little flock, for it is your Father’s good pleasure *to give* you the kingdom.” They had not yet recieved it. Luke xxii. 18, “I will not drink of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come.” Luke xxii. 29—30, “καγω δια τιθεμαι υμιν, (and I promise to you) a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me, that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and

sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." Matt. xix. 28, "verily I say unto you that ye which have followed me. In the *παλιγγένεσια*, *renovation* (or great day of reformation,) when the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of his glory; ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." But the captain of our salvation, and the chief corner stone of the building, must be made perfect through sufferings before he could sit on the throne of his glory. Heb. ii 10. He therefore bowed his head and said it is finished; John xix. 30. Then he who came forth from the Father, left his suffering, serving state, and went to his Father; John xvi. 28; and was seated on the right hand of the throne of the majesty in the heavens; Heb. viii. 1; and as the King of Kings, his head was crowned with many crowns; Rev. xix. 12; having thus ascended on high and led captivity captive, he recieved gifts for men; Psal. lxxviii. 18: Eph. i. 20—22: Heb. ii. 7; and poured out the promise of the Father upon the disciples: the house was filled with the Holy Spirit; Acts ii. 1, 2; the cloven flame crowned the twelve as kings and priests of God; Acts ii. 3; and they, sitting upon twelve *spiritual thrones*, began to pronounce sentences of truth and judgment upon the twelve tribes of Israel; Acts ii. 5—36. In this unparalleled day of regeneration, we find 3000 Jewish church members not only regenerated, but baptized and added, not to the old Mosaic congregation, to which they formerly belonged, but to *the church*; Acts ii. 41—47. Here, (and not before this,) we find the church of God spoken of as an existing body; here the disciples *sat, and ate, and drank, at his table in his kingdom*, while the Son of Man sat on the throne of his glory. Before the Lord ascended to the throne of his glory, he assembled his apostles, Acts i. 4, and commanded them to remain at Jerusalem until they should receive the Holy Ghost, Acts i. 8. The 81 Apostles, eleven of

whom were appointed Matt. x. 1—5, and the other 70, Luke x. 1, beheld the Lord as he ascended, and a cloud received him out of their sight. These returning to Jerusalem with 39 others, began a prayer meeting which continued to the Pentecost. Acts i. 14. During this 8 days meeting we find something like a church in embryo; these 120 disciples having all been baptized by John the Baptist, Acts i. 21, 22, had their names registered, Acts i. 15, and by a *vote* of that body, numbered Matthias among the twelve. Acts i. 26.

In this unfinished state their church rested till the next blessed morning, when their king, from the throne of his glory, poured upon them the promise of the Father, not only to sanction what they had done, but to guide them in completing their organization. They were soon made the instruments of converting 3000 Jews, devout men, (not infants,) and before the day was past they had *a church* of 3120 baptized believers. It is thus evident that the God of heaven did *set up his kingdom* (not in the days of Moses or Abraham, but) in the days of the Caesars, and gave it to the saints of the Most High. Dan. vii. 18. From this time there were added to this *church*, daily, such as should be saved. Acts ii. 47. It does not appear that the 500 brethren, 1 Cor. xv. 6, and the multitude of others who had been baptized from time to time, were at first constituted members of this church; but it is probable they were brought in among the daily additions. Acts ii. 47. At Acts vi. 5, 6, this church appoints her deacons; and this is the first place where the Bible speaks of such a class of officers; and a *solid reason* for which is, that before the *church* at Jerusalem, there was no church of God for deacons to officiate in. And, it is also evident that this church remained for some time the alone organization of the kind; for when Paul was converted and baptized, at Damascus, he traveled to Jerusalem to join himself to the church. But this

cautious body would not receive him on the relation of his own experience, till they had full testimony from the brethren that he was truly converted, Acts ix. 26, 27; and there is no mention made of any other church until after the disciples were scattered abroad upon the persecution that arose about Stephen. Acts xi. 19. But then the blood of the martyrs became the seed of the church, and by divine appointment, Matt. xxviii. 19, 20, churches were planted in many places.

“As to his kingdom, he took possession when the Lord said unto him, Sit thou on my right hand. Christ, as the Son of God, was ever at God’s right hand, equal to him in might and majesty; but, as man, was exalted to honor, not before his glorious ascension. Acts ii. 34: Eph. i. 20.”—*Dr. Clark’s Analysis of 110th Psalm.*

“After the death of Jesus, a great number of his disciples collected at Jerusalem, celebrated there together, and in his name, the feast of Pentecost, and thus formed the *first community* of Christians which had taken place.”—*Villers, on the Reformation, page 174.*

“Now, indeed, was formed a community of the disciples which was called a church.”—*Dr. Campbell’s Lectures on Ecclesiastical History. Lec. 2.*

“Our Savior, first speaking of it, mentions it as that which then was not, but afterwards was to be, when he spake to Peter, And upon this rock *I will build my church.* But, when he ascended into heaven, and the Holy Spirit came down; when Peter was made an instrument of the conversion of 3000 souls, which were added to the former disciples, *then there was a church.* For, after that, we read, the Lord added to the church daily.”—*Dr. Piersons, on the Creed.*

SECTION II.

The Jewish Church and Church of God not one and the same.

WM. T. HAMILTON says, "The sameness of the church under the Old Testament and the New Testament economy is a *vital point*, it is indeed *the turning point* of the whole controversy."—*Essay on Baptism*, p. 36.

MR. SAWYER asserts their identity on pp. 12, 13, 14, 15; but this assertion is not only a *logical* but a *theological* error. However this question may be treated in this age, it is evident that Christ and the apostles never did attempt to prove Judaism and Christianity to be one. The question before us is not can we find a society which resembles the Jews or Mahomedans? but is the Jewish church and the church of God the same?

1. The Jewish church was a type of the church of God. "Then verily the first covenant had also ordinances of divine service and a worldly sanctuary, which stood only in meats and drinks and divers washings, and carnal ordinances imposed on them until the time of reformation."—*Heb.* ix. 1—10. "For the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things," &c.—*Heb.* x. 1. 1. "There were typical persons, as Adam, Abel, Enoch, Abraham, &c. 2. Typical places, as Canaan, Zion, the Temple, &c. 3. Typical classes of persons, as Israelites, &c. 4. Typical utensils, as the Ark, Shew Bread, Candlesticks, &c. 5. Typical offerings. 6. Typical seasons. 7. Typical purifications, &c."

Browne's Bible Dictionary.

"I would understand it not merely as if he had said that this similitude of comparison may be properly used in this present time, as to the *temple of Jerusalem*, which has its holy of holies, as the *Mosaic*

tabernacle had; but that *the constitution* before described was a figurative representation of the Christian Dispensation."—*Doddridge's Expos. Heb. ix. 9.*

"That nation was a typical nation. There was then, literally, a land that was the dwelling place of God, which was a type of heaven, the true dwelling place of God, and an external city of God, which was a type of the spiritual city of God, and an external temple of God, which was a type of his spiritual temple. *So there was an external people and family of God, by carnal generation, which was a type of his spiritual progeny; and the covenant by which they were made a people of God, was a type of the covenant of grace.*"—*President Edward's inquiry into the qualifications for communion, page 88.*

Now when pedobaptists have identified a substance and its shadow—a type and its antitype—they will have identified the two churches, and not before. They can find neither precept or example for infant church membership; therefore they undertake to make out a warrant for their practice by calling the whole Jewish nation a church, and because there were infants in that nation, and God (as they say) *has not forbidden* infant baptism, it is right to practice it. But why not carry out this reasoning, and make it our duty to abstain from, and practice all, that the Jews did, if not expressly taught otherwise in the New Testament? Why do pedobaptists eat swines' flesh? Lev. xi. 7: Isa. lxxv. 4, and refuse to take the brother's widow? Matt. xxii. 24. Why do they keep company with any but of their own church? Acts x. 28. Why do they not continue all the Jewish feasts, sacrifices, &c. &c.?

Again. 1. The Jews had an High Priest, therefore we must have a Pope. 2. This High Priest by Urim and Thummin, was infallible; so our Pope must be. 3. The number seven was sacred, thus:

seventh day, seven clean beasts, &c.; therefore we must have seven sacred things or sacraments. 4. The Jews united their civil and ecclesiastical affairs in one code of laws; so we must submit to the Cambridge and Saybrook platforms, which are after this model. 5. As the Jewish government had a right to tax all the people *one tenth* for the support of the clergy, &c.; so priests now should have power not only to tax and distress indiscriminately, but also to imprison, whip, banish or kill *Quakers, Baptists, witches and other heretics*. 6. We ought to sprinkle water on both male and female, at any age when convenient, (pedobaptists say,) because the Jews circumcised their *males* at the age of eight days, and the New Testament has not forbidden it. I wish to see pedobaptists consistent with themselves; for, while they exert every power to prove that Christ baptized infants, and yet fail, it is obvious that they have his example for several of the Mosaic customs, which they utterly neglect.

Mr. SAWYER has found eight points of similarity between the nation of the Jews and the church; he, therefore, boldly asserts their identity. But I will pledge myself to find fifty stronger similarities between a mouse and a horse. Thus: the one has flesh, blood, bones, skin, hair, head, two eyes, two ears, four legs,—eats oats, drinks water, &c. &c.,—is called beast, brute, creature, animal, &c.; all of which is true of the other. Is a mouse, therefore, a horse? “Is every thing which is like another in any respect, to be called by the same name? Is a man an elephant, because both have the faculties of hearing and seeing?”—*President Day on the Will, page 130*. See also Locke, on Identity and Diversity.

Does diversity loose its power of destroying identity when it comes in contact with pedobaptism? Judaism still exists, and can be compared with the

church of God without the aid of history ; and, are the Jewish synagogues in the city of New York, &c. the same as Christian churches? If we appeal to the Bible, the difference is equally clear. 1. The Jewish Sabbath was the seventh day ; the Christian is the first. 2. Jews reject the New Testament as a dangerous fable ; we receive it as of divine inspiration. 3. If a Jew believed in Christ, he was cast out of the synagogue as a heretic, John ix. 22—24 ; but we acknowledge such only as church members. 4. Jews required neither faith or repentance for admission into their church ; we require both. 5. Jews would not and do not receive baptism as a substitute for circumcision ; but pedobaptists do. 6. Jews did and still do eat the passover of bread and meat ; Christians do not observe this institution. 7. The Jews hold their traditions more sacred than the laws of Christ, Mark vii. 8, 9 ; but *honest Christians* will yield their traditions to divine revelation. 8. The Jews denied the divinity of Christ, John v. vi. vii. ; but Christians believe him divine. 9. The Jewish church was set up by Moses, Ex. xix. xxiv. ; the Christian by Jesus Christ, Acts i. ii. 10. Jewish males only received their circumcision ; Christians of both sexes receive baptism. 11. The *charter* of the Jewish church was annihilated by divine authority ; but that of the Christian church is perpetual. 12. The Jews as a nation and by the authority of their Sandhedrim, did not receive Christ, but *scandalized, persecuted and killed* both him and his followers. See Matt. xxi. 28 : xxvii. 22 : Luke iv. 29 : xiii. 31 : xxii. 2 : John v. 16 : vii. 10—20 : viii. 42—52 : x. 20, &c.

“A saying of Justin Martyr casts some light on this. He asserts that the Jews not only *cursed them in their synagogues*, but they sent out chosen men from Jerusalem to acquaint the world, and particularly

the Jews, every where, that the Christians were an atheistical and wicked sect, which should be detested and abhorred by all mankind. So the Jews in every place persecuted the Christians, and show truly that they are rather the posterity of Hagar than of Sarah."

—*Dr. Clarke's Comment.*

Dr. LIGHTFOOT makes the following quotation from the writings of a learned Rabbi. "In the days of Rabban Gamaliel heretics increased in Israel, (by heretics he meaneth those that turned from *Judaism to Christianity*,) and they troubled Israel and persuaded them to turn from their religion. He seeing this to be a matter of exceeding great consequence, more than any thing else, stood up, he and his Sandhedrim, and appointed a prayer, in which there was a petition to God to destroy those heretics; and this he set among the common prayers, and appointed it to be in every man's mouth, so that they daily prayed against Christians and Christianity." On this Dr. Lightfoot remarks: "The Jews had their emissaries every where abroad, that to the uttermost cried down the gospel, preached against it, went about to confute it, and blasphemed it, and Christ that gave it. Of this there is testimony abundant in the New Testament.——It is needless to instance their derision and detestation of Christ and Christianity, their blasphemy against his blessed name, their hatred and mischievousness against the professors of it. Their writings proclaim their impiety. They had continual opposings among themselves, yet *they all agreed*, like Simeon and Levi, brethren in evil, to oppose, vilify, and blaspheme the gospel."—*Lightfoot's Works*, Vol. 1, pp. 289, 371.

An attempt to identify the Jews and the church of God, must arise from ignorance of the New Testament, or from a wilful determination to pervert the truth, and is looked upon by intelligent men as one of

the weakest of pedobaptist sophisms. It makes the Bible account of Paul's conversion, the pentecostal and other reformatations, to be simply proselyting members from one church to another of the same denomination ; and our faith, hope, charity, baptism and Lord's Supper, to be only the Jewish circumcision, washings, altars, priests, sacrifices, vestments, views and actions continued. But it is evident that the old Mosaic church covenant or constitution, and consequently all that it demanded and promised, was not carried into the church of God, but abolished. Jer. xxxi. 31, 32, "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah ; not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt." See Heb. viii. 6—13. At Zec. xi. 10, 11, we are informed that God broke his covenant which he had made with all the people ; ver. 13 it was done when they weighed thirty pieces of silver for the price of the Shepherd ; ver. 14, and at this time the bond of brotherhood between Judah and Israel was broken and destroyed ; vers. 15, 16, after all this was done, then the great Shepherd took his gathering instrument, and gathered *his flock* ; not the unconverted Jews, but *his sheep*. John x. 11—18. But the Jews, as a people, would not hear his voice or be his sheep ; for they hated the Shepherd and the flock. John x. 26—31 : Rom. viii. 36—39. Thus by divine authority, the Mosaic church covenant was annihilated ; and as Dr. M. HENRY says, "*the Jews were unchurched*," and the apostle could say with propriety, Heb. xiii 10, "*We have an altar whereof they have no right to eat, which serve the tabernacle*." While the pedobaptists are so certain that the inspired writers are silent as to infant church membership, and they are therefore at liberty to prac-

tice *what is not forbidden*, (see Mr. Sawyer, page 2,) we will select one more divine prohibition, Gal. iv. 21—31. Martin Luther says, “This is a wonderful allegory. Abraham is a figure of God, which had two sons; that is to say, two sorts of people, represented by Ishmael and Isaac. These two are born unto him by Hagar and Sarah; the which signify the two Testaments, the old and the New. Therefore Hagar, the bondmaid, bringeth forth bond servants. Ishmael then is not the heir, although he be *the natural son of Abraham*, but remaineth a bond servant. As Paul a little before made Hagar Sinai; so now of Jerusalem, he would gladly make it to be Sarah; but he dare not, neither can he do so, but is compelled to join Jerusalem to mount Sinai. But Jerusalem which is above, that is to say the spiritual Jerusalem, is Sarah; that true lady and free woman, which is the mother of us all, and gendereth us unto liberty. Now this heavenly Jerusalem, which is above, is **THE CHURCH**.——The Pope hath in a manner quite overthrown it, and made the church subject to *man's tradition and ceremonies*.”—*Luther on Galatians*.

It would be well for the church of God if the Pope were alone in this matter. With Luther, I would say this is a wonderful allegory.

1. The law, in verse 21, and the covenant in the allegory, is one and the same.

2. Abraham had two wives, Hagar and Sarah. These represent the two covenants. verse 24.

3. Ishmael and Isaac resemble the people under these two covenants. Ishmael was born a slave; so the old covenant Hagar, or the Mosaic covenant, begat nothing but bondmen, and this earthly Jerusalem, i. e. the Jews, were these bondmen. ver. 25. But Isaac resembles the children of the new covenant, who are Christ's freemen, and the Jerusalem from above is the church of God, ver. 26.

4. Ishmael was not the child of promise, but the natural branch of Abraham, Rom. xi. 24, and represented the literal children of the Jews, the constituents of their visible church, by birthright membership. But Isaac, who was the child of promise, represented the members of the church of God, who are not born church members, but became such by being born as Isaac was, *by faith* in God's promises, and by baptism.

5. As the children of the deserted woman, Sarah, were more than Hagar's, who had the husband, so the children of the covenant of grace and church of God, are to be more numerous than the bondmen of the old Mosaic covenant.

6. As Ishmael, who was the child of the flesh, persecuted Isaac, who was born after the spirit; even so in the apostle's day, and at this time also, do those who plead for church membership on birthright, and other principles, not including regeneration, persecute and try to pull down the children of faith and sons of the new covenant.

7. *But what saith the Scriptures?* CAST OUT. Gen. xxi. 10. Here is positive law. CAST OUT. Gal. iv. 30. This does not look like *silence* on the part of the inspired writers. Yes, from heaven we have the law: CAST OUT *the bond woman*, the old covenant Hagar, which is the *constitution of the Jewish church*. Nor is this all; but again, CAST OUT also the son of Hagar, i. e. *all the children of this covenant, irrespective of age, sexes, sect or condition*; for the God of heaven has said once and again that these sons of this bond woman SHALL NOT BE HEIRS WITH THE SONS OF THE FREE WOMAN. This is an unlimited, positive prohibition, which forbids admitting any person to church membership, except those who are born of the Spirit. And, they who baptize, or otherwise admit persons to church membership before they

can give evidence of their conversion, are guilty, not only of practicing without a thus saith the Lord, but of doing that in the name of the Lord which God has positively forbidden. Prohibitions and instructions like the above are found in a numerous class of texts, but I must close by simply referring you to a few of them. John viii. 33—37: Acts iii. 22—26: Rom. viii. 14, 15: ix. 6—11: Gal. iii. 21—29: v. 1—4: Heb. xii. 18—22: Rev. iii. 12: xxi. 2—10: Mat. xxviii. 16—20: Mark xvi. 14—20: Luke xxiv. 45—49.

SECTION III.

HAVING briefly noticed the church of God, and shown the marked difference between it and the Mosaic church, the constitution and covenant of which was the law, by the faith and deeds of which no flesh could be justified; Rom. iii. 20: iv. 5: vii. 7: Gal. ii. 16: iii. 10; we pass to notice the origin of some of the existing denominations. By the persecution at Jerusalem, Acts xi. 19—26, the disciples were scattered, and went every where preaching the word and planting churches. At this time the Roman empire was in its glory, and governed not only Palestine, but a large portion of the world. The Romans were pagans, and their religion was so intimately connected with their government that the progress of the gospel alarmed both their pagan and their political fears. It is probable that the gospel was first preached in the city of Rome, A. D. 34 or 35, and a church formed there soon after this; for Paul in his epistle, Rom. i. 8, A. D. 60, speaks of them as a church generally known. The management of the Jews was committed to Roman governors, therefore Caligula and Claudius suffered them to persecute Christians by the instrumentality of the Jews. But when Nero

came to the throne, A. D. 54, he took the sword into his own hand, and from the time he set fire to the city of Rome and charged it to the Christians, July 10, A. D. 64, to the time he beheaded Paul, A. D. 66, and finally, up to the time of his death, A. D. 68, he continued to imprison and destroy Christians. Here began the *pagan persecution*. Passing over the conduct of Galba, Otho, Vitellius, Vespasian and Titus, in the 14th year of Domitian's reign, A. D. 95, we find him engaged in a merciless persecution, in which the evangelist John was banished to the island of Patmos, where he wrote the Revelation. The short reign of Emperor Nerva was mild, but when Trajan came to the throne, A. D. 98, his edicts drenched the earth with Christian blood; and Adrian, although petitioned by Quadratus, Aristides and Serenus Gracianus, to have mercy on the church, made its condition but little better. During the reign of Antoninus Pius and Marcus Antoninus, i. e. from A. D. 142 to A. D. 180, there were great persecutions in Asia. Here Polycarp, the pastor at Smyrna, suffered martyrdom, A. D. 166. Toward the close of the reign of M. Antoninus, say A. D. 177, the persecution began in France; Lyons, Vienne and other places suffered inhuman tortures and bloodshed. Passing by the reigns of Commodus, Pertinax, Julianus, Niger and Albinus, we find Severus, A. D. 202, waging war with Christians in Africa; and, soon after, Asia, Egypt, and most of the nations in Europe were fields of slaughter. From the death of Severus, A. D. 211, to the reign of Decius, the church had a little rest; but from A. D. 250 to the close of the Dioclesian persecution, A. D. 311, the church was hunted and killed with greater eagerness than the worst of wild beasts. The mischief done in this persecution will only be known at the last Judgment. It consisted in burning the books and writings of the church; in banishing and

killing, indiscriminately, men, women and children, beyond all account. Godeau, a French writer, says that not less than 17,000 were put to death in one month; and within one year 150,000 were slain in Egypt, besides all that suffered in other places.

Thus the fair churches which had been planted in Palestine, Egypt, Greece, Africa, Italy, France, England, Spain and other places, were scattered by the hand of its enemy. At the death of Constantius, A. D. 306, Constantine became Emperor of the West, and at the death of Maximinus Galerius, A. D. 311, Maxentius became Emperor of the East. An edict was now published which equally tolerated Christianity and paganism. Soon after this a civil war began between the two Emperors, in which Maxentius fell at Rome, A. D. 312, and Constantine became the sole governor of the empire. While he was marching his army from France into Italy, he professed to have seen at mid-day, a luminous cross in the sky, with this inscription on it, "*By this conquer.*" The sight so affected his mind that it resulted in his conversion, and soon after he was master of Rome, he prohibited paganism, and used every laudable means to gather and establish the churches. Having removed the seat of government to Byzantium, and changed its name to Constantinople, he there, as well as elsewhere, opened the churches and closed the pagan temples. He assumed the name of Bishop, and claimed the power of controlling and regulating all the temporalities of the church. From this time Constantine continued to use his property and every power to defend, enlarge, and enrich the church, until he died, May 22, A. D. 337.

His church, having become very rich and fashionable, their pomp and preferments soon drew multitudes of unworthy members into her communion. Her discipline and devotion fled, and in a few years

the church of Rome became dogmatical, insolent, and a mere synagogue of Satan; corrupt in faith, and worse in practice; they not only descended to the level of the ungodly world, but even practiced *paganism* and *Judaism*, and heaven-daring sins in their nominal holy Catholic Church.—*Milner, Jones, Cave and Moshiem.*

While these things existed, many of the most godly members withdrew from them, and established purer churches, or lived alone, as circumstances dictated. During the long and bloody pagan oppression, the spirit of *persecution* had become interwoven with the very nature of the Romans; but as Christianity had become the religion of the nation, they found no vent for this principle, until a violent quarrel took place between Milchiades, Bishop of Rome, and Coecilianus, Bishop of Carthage. Many ministers and churches took sides in this controversy; and, finally a council was assembled at Arles, in France, in which they condemned the Carthaginians and treated them accordingly. Soon after this another dispute began at Alexandria in Egypt. This was the beginning of the *Arian controversy*, which finally affected nearly all Christendom. A council was assembled at Nice, A. D. 325, when Arius and his followers were condemned, excluded and *anathematized*, which resulted in a division of the church at Alexandria, and many others.

From that time, the church of Rome found vent for her *peculiar spirit of persecution*, and the same spirit which pagan Rome had manifested against Christians, was now exhibited by Christian Rome against, not only Arius, but all others who did not fellowship her abominations. Tertullian, who flourished from A. D. 194, to A. D. 220, separated himself from the *pollutions* of the Romish church at Carthage. And Novatian, a man of great learning and

piety, established a church on apostolic principles, in Rome, A. D. 251, and held no communion with the *Judaised* and *paganised* catholics; his followers were called *cathari*, (i. e. puritans.) This church became large, and not only attracted the persons of the virtuous, but the persecutions and anathemas of the Catholics. Thus divisions multiplied until A. D. 660, when a body of *pure Christians* arose, whom the Romans nicknamed PAULICANS and afterward MANICHAEANS, &c., and turned upon them as severe a persecution as that of Dioclesian. This barbarous persecution continued until after what is called the reformation. The first pastors or bishops of Rome, lived subject to the government of the empire, and simply officiated as ecclesiastical teachers, as baptist ministers do now. But when Constantine was converted and assumed the name of Bishop, and took the control of the churches in his empire, he appeared something like a Pope, although he laid no claim to the gospel ministry. Sylvester, who was pastor of the church of Rome from A. D. 313 to 335, and those who succeeded him up to A. D. 590, made no pretensions to universal bishopship. A. D. 588 the church at Constantinople had a pastor called *John the faster*, and Pelagius was pastor at Rome at the same time. Pelagius attempted to exercise some authority over John the faster; and the church at Constantinople, to show a suitable resentment, called a council and declared John UNIVERSAL BISHOP. This exasperated Pelagius and his party, and a dreadful quarrel ensued; but Pelagius soon died, and Gregory the Great succeeded him, A. D. 590. Gregory took not only the place but the spirit of Pelagius. He wrote a letter to Mauricius, Emperor of Constantinople, setting forth the *blasphemous wickedness* of John's assuming the name of *Universal Bishop*. Mauricius paid no favorable attention to Gregory's letter, and

the result was that the anger, pride and revenge of the church of Rome lifted Gregory to the Papal Chair; not in the name of a Pope, but in spirit and authority he was equal to a Pope. Gregory died A. D. 604, and was succeeded by a weak bishop, named Sabinianus, who continued but one year, and was succeeded by Boniface III.

In A. D. 602, a nobleman of Chalcedania, named Phocas, determined to murder Mauricius, Emperor of Constantinople, and reign in his place. Assisted by Boniface, he killed Mauricius, his six sons and two daughters, and took the crown. When Phocas was enthroned, to reward Boniface he declared him *Pope, and the Church of Rome the head of all other churches*, A. D. 606. Not content with being head of the Church, the Pope soon aspired for the Emperorship. In A. D. 732, Gregory III. excommunicated Emperor Leo, Isaurin of Constantinople, because he opposed image worship. Leo fitted out a fleet to seek redress of Gregory by force of arms; but Leo's ships were wrecked in the Adriatic sea, and in this hour of calamity Gregory seized the imperial power, and commenced acting, in all respects, as the sovereign of the people.

The Pope now assumed the name of SOVEREIGN PONTIFF, PRINCE OF THE APOSTLES, PRINCE OVER ALL NATIONS AND KINGDOMS, MASTER OF THE UNIVERSAL WORLD, HIS HOLINESS, GOD ON EARTH, LIGHT OF THE WORLD, MOST HIGH, KING OF KINGS AND LORD OF LORDS, MOST HOLY AND MOST BLESSED, LORD GOD THE POPE!!! and declared that Jesus Christ had granted a twofold power to the church, i. e. the spiritual and temporal sword, and subjected the whole human race to the authority of the Roman Pontiff,—and whoever dare disbelieve it were deemed *heretic*, and stood *excluded from all possibility of salvation*,—and that in good sense and judgment

Christ hath given to PETER and consequently to the POPE, the power of making that to be sin which was no sin, and that which was sin to be no sin, for the Pope holdeth the place on earth, not simply of man but of TRUE GOD. See First Book of Gregory, Decret 9, Chap. 3, and Corpus Juris Canon Extravagants, Com. Lib. 1.

Thus he had power, as God on earth, not only to make and pardon sin, but to make and dethrone kings and emperors, to make and change church ordinances, and the church itself into another thing,—and bind her members under *anathema* to believe “that it was not only lawful, but even praise-worthy to *deceive* and to use the expedient of a *lie* in order to advance the cause of *truth* and *piety*.”—*Moshiem's Church History*, Vol. 1, p. 198.

At the head of an ARMY, falsely called a *church*, fixed in the faith just described, the Pope went on to denounce, not only churches, but whole nations as *heretics*, and with his two-fold power they were converted to his faith and service or inhumanly murdered. In the valley of Piedmont alone, it is supposed that more than a million of the Waldenses and Albigenses were put to death. In France, within the space of thirty years, 39 Princes, 148 Counts, 234 Barons, 147,518 gentlemen, 760,000 persons of a lower rank were destroyed as *heretics*. Thus *war*, *murder*, *burning*, *banishing* and *disgrace* have been dealt out to the defenceless lambs of Christ in Italy, Palestine, Germany, Bohemia, Greece, England, France, Spain, Portugal, Africa, &c., for centuries past, by the hand of this enemy of God and man. Her motto has been, “On pain of *anathema*, permit not the *heretics* to have houses in your districts, or enter into contracts, or carry on commerce, or enjoy the comforts of humanity with Christians.”—*Bull of Pope Martin, V., A. D. 1418*. And to effectually hard-

on their hearts, *Cajetan*, on the authority of Clement VI., published, that "as one drop of Christ's blood was sufficient to redeem the whole human race, the remaining quantity, that was shed in the garden and on the cross, was left as a legacy to the church, to be a treasure from whence indulgences were to be drawn and administered by the Roman Pontiff." But as the Pope and his Catholic church could not have been fighting shadows from A. D. 606 to A. D. 1500, we therefore ask what denomination of Christians sustained these sufferings?

Certainly not the *Lutherans*, for Martin Luther, the founder of this sect was born at Isleben, in Saxony, Nov. 10, A. D. 1483. Both he and his followers were persecuting Roman Catholics till A. D. 1517, when he began to oppose John Tetzel for selling indulgencies in Germany. The Pope's bull against Luther bears date June 15, A. D. 1520, and Dec. 10, A. D. 1520, Luther burnt the bull, decretals and canons at Wittemberge, and began preaching his new doctrine. Their confession of faith was composed by Luther and Melancthon, A. D. 1530. Their number in the United States, A. D. 1836, was 62,266.

It was not the *Presbyterians*, for John Calvin, the founder of this sect, was born in Noyon, in France, July 10, A. D. 1509. He, and his associates were persecuting Catholics till A. D. 1534, when he was converted and fled from the Catholics to Geneva, and established his church there about A. D. 1536. Christianity had flourished in Scotland from the third to the fifth century, at which time the Pope sent Palladius to convert those Scotch Christians, whom he called *Culdees* to papacy, which from this time continued to be the religion of the nation till A. D. 1560. Resby, Hamilton, Wishart, Mill, and others, opposed papacy in their time; but at A. D. 1559, when John Knox returned from Geneva, he introduced John Calvin's

doctrines, and A. D. 1560 Calvinism was established by law as the religion of the kingdom. From that time and place, Calvinism (which we call Presbyterianism,) spread first into England, then into America. The Presbyterians formed a union and opened communion with the Congregationalists, at Saybrook, Sept. 9, A. D. 1708, which continued to May, A. D. 1837, when they excluded the Congregationalists. A. D. 1835 they numbered 274,048; but A. D. 1838, the denomination divided and went to law for their rights, and which party will finally bear the name, or what will be their number, we can not say.

It certainly was not the *Congregationalists*, for the *Brownists* began under the labors of Robert Brown, at Middleburgh, in Zealand, A. D. 1590; and John Robinson, of Norfolk, England, began Brownism in his place, A. D. 1616, and they called themselves *Independents*. When they were persecuted in England they fled to Holland, and from there to America, A. D. 1620; and when they organized churches in this country, they denominated themselves *Congregationalists*. Their first confession of faith was dated Cambridge, A. D. 1648, and their second Saybrook, A. D. 1708. Their present number is about 150,000 members.

Neither were the persecuted the *Episcopalians*. Christianity was planted in England about A. D. 60, and flourished till A. D. 597, when the Pope sent Austin, the Monk, with about forty others, who, by fraud and threats, brought a majority of the British churches under the papal yoke and kept them there. A. D. 1200, John, King of England, interfered with the Papal influence, and Innocent III. laid an interdict upon the kingdom. In A. D. 1211, the Pope excommunicated King John; and A. D. 1212, he dethroned him, and gave Philip Augustus, King of France, authority to take the kingdom. Pandulf, the Pope's legate, took

John's crown and kept it five days, and when John was sufficiently humbled, it was given to him as a present from the Pope. Henry VIII. was a Roman Catholic, and during the reformation he so bitterly opposed Martin Luther, that Pope Leo X. declared him *Defender of the Faith*, A. D. 1521. But, after this, Henry VIII. fell in love with Anna Bullen, and petitioned Pope Clement VII. to divorce him from his wife Catharine; and, because Clement would not, he broke communion with the church of Rome, and declared himself head of the church of England, A. D. 1534. Henry died, A. D. 1547, and Edward VI., his son, reigned to A. D. 1553. Then Mary, his sister, who was a violent Roman Catholic, took the throne, and during her reign protestants suffered great persecution. She died A. D. 1558, and Elizabeth, the daughter of Henry VIII., by Anna Bullen, reigned to 1603. During her reign the Episcopal church was established. Thus England was under Catholicism 960 years; and the principal change that took place when they reformed, or that exists now, is that they reject the Pope's authority and some of his external ceremonies. They plead that their priests and church order are one and the same with the Roman Catholics; and so far from being ashamed of it, they are proud to defend it; and, they are so certain of it, that they will not *exchange pulpits* with any others. They have about 850 churches in the United States.

The sufferers were not *Methodists*, (see Methodist Discipline, page 1,) for they originated in England, A. D. 1737, and in A. D. 1766 they came to America. Their first meeting house was built in John-street, N. York, A. D. 1769. They numbered in A. D. 1835, (counting their probationers, &c.,) 566,957 whites, and 83,135, colored.

From the above it is obvious that it was not the

Lutherans, the *Presbyterians*, the *Episcopalians*, the *Congregationalists* or the *Methodists*, who endured the Romish persecutions; for none of these denominations existed earlier than A. D. 1520. Hence the oldest of these sects is but 318, and the last mentioned but 101 years old. From these unassailable facts you will perceive how vain it is for either of the above denominations to plead that they are the first true church. The Mormons, or any other sect that has sprung up within five or ten years past, could as well attempt to trace the chain of their history to Christ and the apostles. Whenever they have attempted it, they all uniformly acknowledge themselves the recent offspring of that church which they call the mother of harlots and enemy of God; and in attempting to prove their faith and practices correct, they quote her laws and usages as authority.

It is not expected that we should give a church history in this limited essay. All that will be done is to glance at the existence of the church in each successive century; and we shall only be able to notice where the true church flourished in one or two places at the same time. For instance, in giving the history of the Baptists in this century, it would be requisite, in order to a correct view of the denomination, to notice its existence and condition in Europe and Asia; but the limits of this work will only allow me to mention that of our own country. It is acknowledged that there is a people in America called Baptists, and that they have at present 409 associations, 7,135 churches, 4,160 ordained ministers, and that their additions by baptism in A. D. 1837, was 23,070, and that their present number of communicants is 518,126, and that the first Baptist church in America was organized by Roger Williams, in Providence, R. I., A. D. 1639. Since that time the Baptists have been well known; but in tracing their history through

preceding ages, we are obliged to learn their existence and condition mostly from the concessions of Roman Catholics, and other opposers; for, during the Pagan and Papal persecutions, which continued from A. D. 66, to A. D. 1700, it was the constant aim of the Catholics and their *allies* to destroy the *writings*, as well as the persons of the true church.

Owing to the different languages of those nations where the followers of Christ have lived, and to the asperities of their opposers, the church has been known by the name of Baptists, Anabaptists, Wickliffites, Lollards, Hugonots, Mennonites, Hussites, Petrobrusians, Albigenes, Waldenses, Paulicans, &c.; and to oppose image worship, infant baptism, transubstantiation, and the unwarrantable power of the Pope, have ever been characteristics of this people. Therefore Roman Catholics have heaped upon us names as above, and persecuted us as heretics; and the pedobaptists, who are the offspring of the Romish church, as we have shown, have adopted the same course, realizing that if the true church can be traced down to the apostles, independent of the Romish church, it will set the origin of their denominations in no favorable light. Hence the calumny and reproach which Milner, Cave, Moshem, &c., have cast upon Servetus, Wickliff, Muncer, Huss, Jerome, Waldo, Hugo, Claude, Constantine, Tertulian, Novatian, &c., and the unwarrantable encomiums which they constantly heap on Martin Luther and John Calvin, who were but *imperfect imitators* of the above named reformers.

In order to appreciate the writings of these pedobaptist authors, the reader should just consider how the Baptists in this age would be represented were our opponents (say Mr. Chapin,) to write a church history. Is it not evident that we should be wholly neglected or grossly misrepresented? And such has been the conduct of pedobaptist writers of past ages. To

obtain correct knowledge of the true church, I would refer you to the histories written by Perrin, Ivemy, Jones, Backus, Benedict, Robinson's researches, and Moreland's history of the Waldenses, &c. As it can be proved that all the dissenting pedobaptist churches arose in and since the sixteenth century, they have made a mighty effort to fix our origin at about the same time. Hence their endeavors to make the unlearned believe that the Baptists had their origin in the Rustic war, or Munster rebellion. It is a fact that in A. D. 1524, there was much uneasiness among the German peasants because of the oppressions of the feudal system and Catholic tythes; and the Catholics of Saubia rebelled, but this was soon suppressed.

In A. D. 1520, Luther published, in the German language, a tract on Christian liberty, and during the winter of A. D. 1524-5 this tract was industriously circulated in Saubia, Munster, and vicinities; and the spirit of reformation had so kindled through Germany that in the spring of A. D. 1525, about 300,000 men, not exclusively Lutherans, Catholics, Baptists or non-professors, but of all sorts collectively, arose for liberty. One Thomas Muncer, a disciple of Luther, whom the people called Luther's curate, and Luther called him his Absalom, had now become a Baptist, and after the Munster revolt had been going on for some time, he drew up a memorial or manifesto for the revolutionists, which was a mild, pacific and religious document. That there were some Baptists engaged in that affair is evident, but "it is certain that the disturbance in Munster was commenced by Bernard Rotman, a Lutheran priest, and that several other Lutheran priests assisted in it for several months before Muncer visited the place."—*Ivemy*, p. 16.

"The Catholics uniformly say that Luther's doctrine led to the rebellion, and that his disciples were the prime movers of it, and affirm that 130,000 Lu-

therans fell in the Rustic war. This, they say, is the fruit of the new doctrine; this is the fruit of Luther's gospel."—*Milner, vol. 5, pp. 320, 327.*

It is thus evident, by referring to the Catholics, who equally hated the Lutherans and the Baptists, and, therefore, were impartial judges, that the Munster affair did not originate the Baptists, or the Baptists the Munster affair; but, that it was an effort for Christian liberty, moved on by the Lutherans,—and, had they been successful, no doubt but Luther would have appeared at the head, for it is evident he was at the bottom of it. But, as it failed, and therefore was inglorious, Luther disclaimed his connection, and modern pedobaptists have attempted to charge it to the Baptists.

But, leaving this, as none but the ignorant can be made to believe that the Baptist church had its origin in the sixteenth century, we pass to notice that, in A. D. 1764, there was a history of religion published in London, in four volumes, in which it was written:—"It is clear from many authors that Wickliff rejected infant baptism, and that on this doctrine his followers agreed with modern Baptists." His followers were called Lollards, and Waldenses, and persecuted as heretics. In the eighteenth century we find John Howard, the philanthropist, and multitudes of others in England and other nations of Europe, decided Baptists. About A. D. 1655, the Duke of Savoy dreadfully persecuted the Baptists in the South of France and the vallies of Piedmont, whom he called Waldenses, Valdenses and heretics. At this time Oliver Cromwell was Protector of England, and John Milton, the poet, was Secretary of State. The intelligence of the Waldensian massacre reached London, May 20, A. D. 1655, upon which Milton wrote a thrilling sonnet, of which this first verse is a specimen:

"Avenge, O Lord, thy slaughtered saints, whose bones,
Lie scattered on the Alpine mountains cold:
Even them who kept thy truth so pure of old,
When all our fathers worshipped stocks and stones."

That Cromwell and Milton favored the Waldenses, or Baptists, in sentiment, is equally evident from the letters which Milton wrote to the Christian Princes of Europe, (see Jones' Church History, vol. 2, pp. 319—336,) the influence of which moved the Duke of Savoy to stop the persecution; but he renewed it again A. D. 1663, and thus persecutions continued until A. D. 1686, when he issued orders to remove or kill all the Waldenses in his territory, which resulted in destroying many and removing more into Switzerland and other countries. See Burnett's Letters from Italy, Letter 1, pp. 57, 58.

But, as it is well known that the Baptists were numerous in all Europe and America in the sixteenth century, we pass to notice that, in this century Martin Luther, John Calvin and some others, broke off from the Catholics. Luther took with him the doctrine of consubstantiation, which is but another name for transubstantiation, and the doctrine of infant baptism, together with other errors; and Calvin brought with him not only the doctrine of infant baptism, but the spirit of persecution, which was too manifest in the murder of Servetus and other acts of the kind. From A. D. 1250, up to A. D. 1400, the Waldenses suffered dreadful persecutions in France, Germany and Netherlands; and a small number of them fled to Calabria, where they formed a church and lived in the apostolic faith until A. D. 1560, when the Calabrian Waldenses formed a union with the Calvinists at Geneva, and so far conformed to the Romish religion that they baptized their infants. To this, with a few instances of the kind, modern pedobaptists refer, to prove that the Waldenses were not Baptists; but we

could as well say because one Baptist church in America became corrupt in faith, therefore they all had. The few individuals who were drawn into infant baptism and the like errors, by Luther and Calvin, are but slight exceptions.

Dr. MOSHIEM says, "The sect in England which reject the custom of baptizing infants, are not distinguished by the title of Anabaptists, but by that of Baptists. It is, however, probable, that they derived their origin from the German and Dutch Mennonites.——From their confession of faith, which was published in A. D. 1643, it appears plain that their religious sentiments were the same then that they are at this day.——The true origin of that sect which acquired the denomination of Anabaptists, by administering anew the rite of baptism to those who came over to their communion; and derived that of Mennonites from the famous man to whom they owe the greatest part of their present felicity, is hid in *the remote depths of antiquity*, and is of consequence difficult to be ascertained.——The modern Mennonites not only consider themselves as the descendants of the Waldenses, who were so grievously oppressed and persecuted by the despotic heads of the Romish church, but pretend, moreover, to be the purest offspring of those respectable sufferers.——The Mennonites are not entirely mistaken when they boast of their descent from the Waldenses, Petrobrusians, and other ancient sects, who are usually considered as witnesses of the truth in times of universal darkness and superstition. Before the rise of Luther and Calvin, there lay concealed in almost all the countries of Europe, particularly in Bohemia, Moravia, Switzerland and Germany, many persons who adhered tenaciously to the following doctrines, which the Waldenses, and Wickliffites, and Hussites had maintained, some in more disguised, and others in

more open and public manner, viz: That the kingdom of Christ, or the visible church which he had established upon earth, was an assembly of true and real saints, and ought therefore to be inaccessible to the wicked and unrighteous, and also exempt from all those institutions which human prudence suggests to oppose the progress of iniquity, or correct or reform transgressors.——The religious opinions which still distinguish the Mennonites from all other Christian communities, flow directly from the *ancient* doctrine of the Anabaptists concerning the nature of the church. It is in consequence of this doctrine that they admit none to the sacrament of baptism, but persons that have come to the full use of their reason, because infants are incapable of binding themselves by a solemn vow to a holy life, and it is altogether uncertain whether or no in mature years they will be saints or sinners.——Before the rise of Luther and Calvin, there lay concealed in almost all the countries of Europe, persons who had adhered tenaciously to the principles of the Dutch Baptists.”—*Church History, cent. 16th, sec. 3, part 2.*

In A. D. 1530, Bullinger, in the preface to his sermon on the Revelation, says, “for 400 years and more, in France, Italy, Germany, Bohemia and other countries, throughout the world, the Waldenses have sustained their profession of the ‘gospel of Christ.’”—*Perrin’s History, chapt. 6.*

A. D. 1533, Luther published the confession of faith of the Waldenses, with a preface of his own, in which he acknowledges them *the true church of God*. Beza, in his treatises of “the famous pillars of learning and religion,” says, “as for the Waldenses, I may be permitted to call them the very seed of the primitive and pure Christian church.”—*Moreland’s History of the Churches of Piedmont, p. 58.*

JACOB MERRINGUS says “that he had in his pos-

session a confession of faith, in the German language, of the Baptists called Waldenses, which asserts that in the beginning of Christianity there was no baptizing of infants, and that their forefathers practiced no such thing."—*History, part 2, p. 738.*

LIMBORCH says, "To speak candidly what I think of all the modern sects of Christians, the *Dutch Baptists* most resemble the Albigenses and Waldenses."—*History of the Inquisition, vol. 1, chapt. 8.*

A. D. 1530, George Moreland published a history of the Waldensian churches, in which he says that "at that time there were more than 800,000 communicants." See Moreland's *Evangelical Churches*, p. 224.

A. D. 1400, Henry IV., King of England, enacted a law for the burning of Waldensian heretics, and from that time up to April 11, A. D. 1612, when Edward Wightman was burnt at Litchfield, there were multitudes who suffered imprisonment and death for refusing to believe infant baptism, and other Romish traditions. A. D. 1415, John Huss and Jerome of Prague, two famous Baptist ministers, and leaders of the reformation in Bohemia, were burnt, by order of the Popish council of Constance. Wickliff's writings were destroyed, and his bones dug up and burnt. William Sawter, Thomas Badby, and Sir John Oldcastle, and a number of the stars of the true church fell during this century, but still the Baptist church flourished and multiplied throughout the world. It was in A. D. 1365, that John Wickliff began to be popular as a reformer, and great multitudes followed him. During his labors nearly all England was awakened. He translated the Bible into English, and wrote many books. His followers were called Lollards, after Walter Lollard, a Dutch Baptist, who came from Germany into England, A. D. 1315. Lollard was so active, and blessed of God, that it was with much difficulty that the Catholics

kept the kingdom from a religious revolution. Dr. Hurd says, "it is pretty clear, from the writings of many learned men, that Dr. John Wickliff, the first English reformer, either considered infant baptism unlawful, or at least unnecessary."—*Ivemy, Hist. p. 56.*

A. D. 1382, July 12, Richard II., King of England, published an order for the bishops to seize and imprison all persons suspected of Lollardism; and, during this persecution, Hereford, Rapyngdon, Aysh-ton and many others suffered. Reinerius says that "in A. D. 1259, the *Paterine* (another nickname for true Christians,) church at Alba, had more than 500 members; and, that at *Coneorezza*, more than 1500, and many others were very large." A. D. 1254, the Popish council of Alba condemned the Waldenses as heretics, and because there were many of them in and about that place, they called them Albigenes. A. D. 1229, during the French persecution, the Waldenses spread themselves throughout Italy, and Reinerius says that about A. D. 1250 they had churches in Albinia, Lombardy, Milan, Romagna, Vencenza, Florence, &c., and in A. D. 1280, they were quite plenty in Sicily."—*Perrin's History, book 2, chapt. 16.*

A. D. 1215, the Bishop of Arles wrote to Pope Innocent III., complaining that his place was troubled with a great many Waldensian heretics, who said it was to no purpose to baptize children."—*Opera Innocent, tertii tom 2, p. 776.* A. D. 1110, Peter Bruis, and A. D. 1147, Henry wrote against the Catholics, and in reply, Peter, the Catholic Abbot of Clugny, wrote against the Petrobrusians and Henricians, and charged them with holding the following errors, "that infants are not baptized or saved by the faith of another, or that baptism, without their own faith, does not save, and that those that were baptized in infancy, when grown up, should be baptized again,—nor are

they then rebaptized, but rather rightly baptized.”—*Hist. Eccl. Mag. cent. 12, chapt. 5, p. 332.*

Dr. STENNET quotes the following words from Cassanion’s history of the Waldenses: “Some writers have affirmed that they approved not of the baptism of infants, and I can not deny that the greatest part were of that opinion; but the truth is, they did not reject the sacrament of baptism, but only accounted it unnecessary to infants, because they are not of age to believe, or capable of giving evidence of their faith.”—*Appendix to Stennet, pp. 81, 82.*

Dr. WALL admits that the Waldenses were antipe-dobaptists. (See Wall’s History of Baptism, p. 171.) As the Catholics baptized by immersion, the ancient Baptists had no difficulty with them about the mode. Hence, image worship, infant baptism, transubstantiation and the Pope’s authority, were the chief subjects of contention; and, for opposing these, they suffered persecution. A. D. 1166, thirty Waldenses suffered martyrdom at Oxford, England; and, during the persecution in the South of France, there were so many of them came into England, that in the reign of Henry III. the orders of the Friars Minorites were introduced, to suppress the Waldensian heresy.”—*Arch Bishop Usher, in Iverny, vol. 1, p. 59.*

A. D. 1160, Peter Waldo was a famous Baptist preacher; and, some have supposed, the Waldenses derived their name from him, but it is evident that they were at first called *Valdenses*, from their being in the vallies of Piedmont, and that *Valdenses* was finally changed into *Waldenses*; and Reinerius Saccho, the Inquisitor, who wrote but 80 years after Peter Waldo, assures us that the Albigenes, or Waldenses had flourished more than 500 years before Waldo’s time. See Dr. Rankin’s History of France, vol. 3, p. 198—202.

A. D. 1160, and forward for about 20 years, Waldo

was persecuted by the Catholics; but yet as a faithful reformer, he preached boldly against Popish power, image worship, infant baptism and transubstantiation, in Dauphiny, Picardy, Germany, and finally in Bohemia, where he died, 1179. Wherever he preached multitudes were converted to God. The work of revival did not stop at his death, but extended into Bulgaria, Croatia, Dalmatia and Hungary, and multitudes of Baptist churches were planted, which flourished through the thirteenth century. In A. D. 1315, it is calculated there were not less than 80,000 of these antipedobaptist Christians in Bohemia. See Perrin's History, chapt. 1, 2.

A. D. 1154, a small society of these Waldensian Christians came into England, and William, of Neuburgh, a Monkish historian, says that "they came from Gostynen, (in Poland,) where they were as numerous as the sand of the sea, and that they had sorely infested France, Spain and Italy." Dr. Henry's history of England speaks of the dreadful persecution of this people, on page 338.

A. D. 1147, St. Bernard, in his letter to the Earl of St. Gyles, says that one of the errors of the Henricians was "that the infants of Christians are hindered from the life of Christ, the grace of baptism being denied them; [and he adds,] they laugh at us for baptizing infants."

A. D. 1140, Henry, an Italian Baptist, became very popular, and his followers were called Henricians. He sustained the sentiments of the denomination, and preached successfully in Switzerland, Mans, Bourdeaux, and A. D. 1147, in Toulouse. He was finally condemned at the Council of Rheims, and died in prison, A. D. 1158.

A. D. 1140, Evervinus, a Catholic priest of Germany, wrote to St. Bernard concerning a great number of *heretics* in his neighborhood, who cheerfully

suffered death rather than give up their doctrine ; and, among other heresies, he said "they do not hold to the baptism of infants, alledging as a proof of their sentiments, Mark xvi. 16, *he that believeth and is baptized, &c.* These in our country we call *Cathari*, in Flanders they call them *Piphles*, in France *Tisserands*, and Egbert the Monk says they are increased to *great multitudes*, throughout all countries." See Dr. Allix's remarks, pp. 150, 152.

A. D. 1139, Arnold, of Brisca, roused the people of his charge to active opposition against the awful corruptions of the church of Rome, and Pope Innocent II. summoned the Latteran Council, and anathematized and condemned Arnold to perpetual silence, as a Waldensian heretic, because he preached against transubstantiation, infant baptism, &c. But, so far from being silent, he entered Rome and preached with such success that nearly all the city arose against Popery ; and it is a well known fact that Pope Eugenius was consecrated in a fortress without the city, to escape the violence of the people, but by force of arms Arnold was finally taken and burnt, A. D. 1155. See Edinburgh Encyclopedia, article Arnold, and Dr. Allix, p. 169.

A. D. 1120, the Waldenses published a treatise concerning antichrist, which contains several sermons of their ministers of that age. In this work they prefer several charges against the Pope, as the antichrist, the third of which is "*that he baptizes children.*" See Perrins' history, pp. 60, 62.

A. D. 1110, "Peter de Bruis labored with great success in the South of France, and multitudes became his disciples, who were called Petrobrusians. They strenuously advocated that baptism was to be administered only to adults." See Moshiem's Church History, cent. 12, part 2, chapt. 5.

A. D. 1110, "Peter de Bruis, and his disciple Hen-

ry, taught that infants ought not to be baptized, and they made many converts.”—*Du Pin, vol. 3, p. 702.*

A. D. 1100, “the Waldenses spread themselves through Poland and Lithuania, and ever since that they have been propagating their doctrine there, which differs but little from the modern Baptists.” See *Le Sieur de La Popeliniere, history of France.*

A. D. 1066, William the Conqueror ascended the throne of Britain, and during his reign many Waldenses from France, Germany and Holland, came into England. They remained in the peaceful possession of Christian liberty, and greatly multiplied, until A. D. 1218, when there was a Popish order sent to the Bishops of England to suppress the Waldensian heresy.

About 1050, Berengarins arose, and greatly opposed the Popish doctrines. He was principal of the Academy at Tours, in France. In A. D. 1055, a Council was assembled at Tours by Pope Leo IX., to examine the heresy of Berengarius; and another at Rome, A. D. 1078. But, after preaching successfully against image worship, infant baptism and Papal power, he died in peace, A. D. 1088. “During this century the Emperors of Germany and Kings of England opposed the Pope’s dominion.———Vast numbers about Orleans, in France, and in Flanders, testified against transubstantiation, purgatory, penance, relics, traditions, &c.———And some good historians assert that almost all the French, Italians and English were infected with this opinion.”—*Brown’s Bible Dictionary, p. 153.*

“Amid the shocking ignorance and wickedness of the tenth century, numbers in Germany, France and Britain, still opposed the worship of images, &c. A. D. 909, the Council of Soissons, in France, published a confession, (of faith,) mostly the same in substance with those of the protestant churches. (The difference was that this confession disapproved of in-

fant baptism, which pedobaptists practice.) The Council of Rheims declared the Popes censurable if they did amiss. Many churches refused to part with the use of the Scriptures in their own language. Athelstan, King of England, caused them to be translated into the language of his Anglo-Saxon subjects. Heriger, the Abbot of Lobes, with Affric and Wulfin, of England, opposed transubstantiation. Florus, Prudentius, Tricassin, Lupus, Servatus and other noted clergymen, opposed, &c.”—*Brown’s Bible Dictionary*, p. 153.

This century did not afford many reformatations. The life and prosperity of the church, as to means, depended more on the influence of men in the preceding century, especially that of CLAUDE. However, from A. D. 950, to A. D. 1050, the Baptist church was active; and, notwithstanding the persecutions, they continued to increase. Turin, the capital of Piedmont, was formerly the residence of the King of Sardinia, and in A. D. 1798, it had 100,000 inhabitants. A. D. 817, Claude was promoted to the See of Turin. He soon began to bear testimony against Romish pollutions, and continued his labors in Turin for about 20 years; and the vallies of Piedmont, which belonged to the bishopric of Turin, received their religion from him,—and it is abundantly proved that the churches in Piedmont, Milan, Turin, &c., held no communion with the church of Rome, but were of the same faith with the *modern Baptists* and *ancient Paulicans*.

“Claude, Bishop of Turin, in his numerous writings, maintained that all the apostles were equal to Peter—that Jesus Christ was the only head of the church—that the church is fallible, and no *traditions* ought to be regarded in religion—that no prayers ought to be made for the dead, nor images of saints or angels to be worshiped—that all superstitious pil-

grimaces and penance ought to be laid aside—that the elements of the Lord's Supper are but means of representing the body and blood of Christ to believers.” —*Brown's Bible Dictionary*, p. 152.

Claude may be properly called the *Apostle* of the reformation, while Luther and Calvin were but *imitators* of this great man; and, had they followed him fully, and left infant baptism and other Romish notions behind, they would have been greater blessings to the world. It is true that the ninth was a dark century, and that Romish doctrines greatly covered the world; but the reason why they did was because the Romans were powerful in arms, and when they subdued a nation or people, they compelled them to submit to their religion; thus infant baptism spread by physical and not by moral power. Meanwhile Nicephorus, Leo V., Michael III., Emperors of the East, with nearly all the Greek Bishops, opposed these Catholic innovations in religion; and Rhemigius, Bishop of Lyons, and Valentine and the Liugonensian, and Christians known by other names, stood fast on apostolic grounds.

A. D. 726, Leo Isaurian, the Greek Emperor, who resided at Constantinople, but by right governed Italy as well as what is now called the Ottoman Empire, discovering that the church at Rome was beginning image worship, issued an edict against the practice. At this time Gregory II., who was Pope or Bishop of Rome, violently opposed the edict, and continued to do so until he died, A. D. 731, and Gregory III., partaking the spirit of his predecessor, excluded Leo, A. D. 732. The great majority of the inhabitants of Italy, agreeing with Gregory, were carried on by the tide of popular feeling, to embrace not only image worship and infant baptism, but sunk into other errors to which they had been strangers until this time. It was in this contest that the Italian provinces separated

from the Greek empire, and the Greek and Roman churches ceased to fellowship each other. Whatever defects may have characterized the Greek church in this age, it is evident that they maintained the substance of Scripture doctrines and practices, and were the very churches which had arisen successively out of those planted by the apostles; and that their number at this time was much larger than those that had followed Gregory. Among these Greek churches the Paulicans appeared as reformers, as the Waldenses did among the Romans.

A. D. 660, the *Paulicans* arose, in the town of Mananalis, in the vicinity of Somosata. Here lived a man by the name of Constantine, who entertained at his house a deacon of a church in Syria, who had been carried away captive by the Mahometans, and was now on his return. From this passing stranger Constantine received a copy of the New Testament, in the Greek language. He studied it with care, and began to publish its contents, and soon a Christian church was collected. In a little time several individuals arose among them qualified for the ministry, and many churches were collected in Armenia and Cappadocia. Their public appearance attracted the notice of the Catholic party, who immediately began to persecute them, calling them Manicheans and Paulicans. Constantine continued his labors, and Pontus and Cappadocia, and all Asia Minor to the west of the Euphrates, had pure religion revived again. As they increased and spread to the west, they were often identified with the Waldenses, because they opposed image worship, infant baptism and the power of the Pope, which were the common characteristics of both. We can trace the history of the church by the persecutions which they suffered under the name of Paulicans, to A. D. 810.—*Jones' Church History*, vol. 1, pages 384—387.

But why should we stay to trace the history of the Baptist church in that age, by the sufferings of Christians bearing one name. "There have been whole *nations of martyrs*, who, after witnessing a good confession before men and angels, have been sacrificed by thousands to the blind rage of superstition.——

It would be an unpardonable omission to pass entirely unnoticed that venerable and *primitive people*, who were the *depository of Christian truth during so many ages*, when darkness covered the earth, and gross darkness the people. The PAULICANS in the East and the WALDENSES in the West, *divide this praise*.

The Paulicans preceded the public appearance of the Waldenses.——They appeared in Cappadocia and Armenia about the middle of the seventh century, and the name of their founder was Constantine.——

——He became a preacher of righteousness, and was soon surrounded by a numerous band of disciples, who endeavored in all things to conform themselves to *scriptural precepts*. This sect, in general, received the name of Paulicans, from the great veneration which they professed for the epistles of Paul. Their progress was rapid, and the light of truth had nearly spread over Asia Minor, when the fearful storm of persecution descended upon them.——These Christians, now generally called Waldenses, were scattered through different countries, and were known by various names in different situations, though a general agreement of doctrine and practice prevailed among them."—*Christian Martyrs, by the American S. S. Union*, pp. 102–106.

In many instances, in this and succeeding ages, the Baptist church was charged with Arianism, because they did not admit that the consecrated wafer was the *real body of Christ*; and modern pedobaptists, adopting the language of the Catholics, still continue to

stigmatize those true disciples with the same opprobrious epithet.

We have hastily glanced at the existence of the church through successive ages, until we have arrived at the time when the church of Rome assumed her antisciptural power, and properly became *the mother of harlots and the abomination of the earth*. We could here leave our cause, believing that every candid mind would be satisfied that from this time down to the apostles, the churches were generally built on Scriptural grounds. But to do justice to his character, and show that the Romish church had become corrupt even earlier than this, I would remark that A. D. 251, Novatian separated himself from the corruptions of the church of Rome, and established a church on apostolic principles. "Novatian was an elder in the church of Rome, a man of extensive learning, holding the same doctrine as the church. His address was eloquent, and his morals irreproachable. In seasons of prosperity many persons rushed into the church; in times of persecution they denied the faith; when the squall was over they came again to the church. The Bishops, fond of proselytes, encouraged all this, and also began to exchange the Christian virtues for a vain show at Easter. Cornelius, who had often countenanced such practices, was nominated for Bishop at the death of Fabian. Novatian being unreconciled to their half *paganism* and half *Judaism*, opposed his election; and when Cornelius was finally elected, Novatian and many others, withdrew and established a church by themselves. Great multitudes followed his example, and all over the empire *puritan* churches were constituted, which flourished throughout the succeeding two hundred years. Tertulian had left the church at Carthage near fifty years before this, for the same reasons; and Privatus, and several more had repeatedly remonstrated against

the alterations taking place in the church. The Roman Catholics charge Novatian with being the parent of an innumerable multitude of congregations of *puritans*, all over the empire.”—*Robinson’s Ecc. Researches*, p. 126.

That Novatian, and the puritans of that age, had the same views of a gospel church and the subjects of baptism that the Baptists have now, is too obvious to admit of debate. Indeed, the Roman Catholics themselves, notwithstanding all other corruptions, had not yet introduced infant baptism. It remained for after and darker ages to originate this antisciptural practice, as we shall presently show. We have not introduced the puritans of that age because the true church was confined to them, but simply to show that the church of Rome early became so corrupt that good men fled from her influence. It is a well known fact, that during the third, fourth and fifth centuries, there were multitudes of churches beside those who were the immediate followers of Novatian, in nearly all the kingdoms of Europe and a great part of Asia, that still kept the ordinances as the apostles had delivered them. With regard to the first two centuries after the apostles, there can be no doubt that the churches were purely Baptist. Dr. Moshiem, a violent opposer of the Baptist denomination, admits that “the sacrament of baptism was administered publicly twice every year, at the festivals of Easter and Pentecost, or Whitsunday, by the Bishop or Presbyters, in consequence of his authorization and appointment. The *persons* that were to be baptized, *after they had repeated the creed, confessed and renounced their sins*, and particularly the devil in his pompous allurements, were *immersed under water*, and received into Christ’s kingdom by a solemn invocation of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, according to the *express command* of our blessed Lord.”—*Eccl. Hist. cent. 2, sec. 13.*

Again. "The sacrament of baptism was administered in this century without the public assemblies, in places appointed and prepared for the purpose, and was performed by *immersion of the whole body* in the baptismal font."—*Mosheim's Ecc. hist. cent. 1, part 2, sec. 8.*

We have thus hastily traced the church down to the apostolic age, and find that although we are now surrounded by many denominations, yet they are of so recent origin, that previous to the rise of Lutheranism, A. D. 1517, it was vastly different; and as we approach the apostolic age, their number appears still less, until we arrive at A. D. 325, when the first general division took place at Alexandria, respecting the doctrine of Arius. From that time, down to the organization of the first church at Jerusalem, A. D. 33, there was but one denomination, which has since been called by various names: First, *Disciples*, then *Christians*, and in after ages several nicknames, as we have seen; and at present it is known by the name of the *Baptized Church*, to distinguish it from those churches which merely sprinkle. Thus evident it is, that the Bible and impartial history sustain our claim to apostolic church origin; and that not only John Huss, Jerome of Prague and John Wickliff, were martyrs of our church, but equally demonstrates that Ignatius, Irenæus, Polycarp, and the multitudes who have sealed their faith with their blood since them, were Baptists.

We should keep in mind that nearly every question has two sides; and while the controversy between us and the pedobaptists respects church origin, we are happy to have their full concession that they are recent dissenters from the Roman Catholics; and that the Baptist church is not only the *true church* of God, but that for her "it is easy to trace a succession of

witnesses for Jesus Christ against HIS rival at Rome."
—*Brown's Bible Dictionary*, p. 152.

There are four kinds of Baptists in the United States, and the Am. Almanac for 1839 gives the following statistics:

Regular Baptists, 452,000 communicants; Free-will do., 33,876; 7th day do., 4,500; Six-principle do., 2,117.—Total population, 430,000.

Regular Presbyterians, 274,084 communicants; Cumberland do., 50,000; Associate do., 16,000; Reformed do., 3,000; Associate Reformed do., 12,000.—Total population, 2,175,000.

Congregationalists, 160,000 communicants:—Population, 1,400,000

Episcopal Methodists, 650,103 communicants; Protestant do., 50,000—total population 3,000,000.

CHAPTER IV.

SUBJECTS OF BAPTISM.

SECTION I.

Of Moral and Positive Law.

MORAL law is the eternal rule of right, founded in the nature and fitness of things, which is, was and ever will be binding upon all rational creatures, whether good or evil; a summary of which was given to Moses, Ex. xx. 3—17. It never was identified with the Mosaic covenant, though like the covenant of circumcision, it existed with it; and when Christ came, it was not abolished with the ritual services, but explained and enforced by the precepts and examples of the Savior, so that it forms a great part of the gospel. Matt. v. 17: xxiii. 23: John vii. 19: Matt. xxii. 36—40: Luke x. 26—28: 1 Cor. xiii. 1—13. This law is given in general rules, and from them many of our particular duties are inferred. But an invariable rule respecting *inferences* is, that we are never to do less than the expressed law requires.

Positive law differs mostly from moral in these four particulars:

1. The moral law, from the very nature of it, can never be revoked; but positive law may be abolished at any time. But, "It requires the same strength to dissolve as to create an obligation."—*Blackstone's Commentary on the Laws of England, vol. 1, book 1, chapt. 2.*

2. Positive law is only obligatory on the persons immediately referred to, and expressed in the law. Thus, when God commanded Abraham to circumcise every man child born in his house and bought with his money, it did not make it his duty to circumcise all the *females* and *gentiles*; so when Christ commanded the apostles to baptize believers, it did not authorize them to baptize *infants* and *unbelievers*. The letter of positive law is the measure of our duty.

3. Positive law does not originate simply in the nature and fitness of things, but rests solely on the *plain, expressed* will of God, without respect to any other reason for it. Thus the moral law, "*thou shalt love the Lord thy God,*" and the reason is because he is infinitely lovely; and the positive law says, Gen. xxii. 2, "Take now thy son, and offer him for a burnt offering," Acts ii. 38, "Be baptized;" and the reason is because God commands it,—and the time, place and instruments must be expressed, if they make any part of the service required. Thus, Gen. xxii. 2, "In the land of Moriah, upon one of the mountains which I will tell thee of." John i. 33, "He that sent me to baptize (*ἐν ὕδατι*) in water." Matt. xxviii. 19, "Baptizing them."

4. Positive law differs from moral, because the rule is *definite*, and no *inference* drawn from it can make any part of our duty. My son is under obligation to reverence me, whether I command him to or not; but he is not therefore under obligations to burn up my refuse papers, till I command him; and when I

have ordered him to burn them, he is not at liberty to *infer* that he should burn my library also.

But, this view of moral and positive law is not a matter of difference between the Baptists and pedobaptists; for I could quote hundreds of the most able pedobaptist authors who speak as definitely as the following: "The positive law is what we know to be the will of God by *his express word only*."—*Reeve's Apology*, vol. 2, p. 2. "Positive institutions are the free effects of the will of God, depending originally and solely on revelation."—*Dr. Owen, on the Holy Spirit*, book 1, chapt. 3, sec. 3. "Sacraments are positive precepts which are to be measured only by the institution, in which there is not room for us to carry them any further."—*Bp. Burnett's Expos. of the Articles*, p. 279. "Positive precepts depend wholly on the will of the lawgiver, being actually limited to this *specification, this manner, this matter, this institution*. Whatsoever comes besides it hath no foundation in the will of the legislator, and therefore can have no warrant or authority. That it be *obeyed or not obeyed* is the question, and all the VARIETY."—*Dr. Dubit*, book 2, chapt. 3, sec. 14.

"What man dare go in a way which has neither *precept* nor *example*, from a way that has a full current of *both*. Who knows what will please God, but himself? and has he not told us what he expects from us? Can that be *obedience* which has no *command* for it?———O the pride of man's heart! that instead of being a law-obeyer will be a law-maker.—I should tremble to add or diminish."—*R. Baxter's Plain Scripture Proofs*, p. 24.

"A catholic spirit is not speculative latitudinarianism. It is not an indifference to all opinions; this is the spawn of hell, not the offspring of heaven; this unsettled state of thought; this being driven to and

fro, and tossed about by every wind of doctrine, is a great curse, not a blessing. A man of a true catholic spirit does not halt between two opinions, nor vainly endeavor to blend them into one. Observe this, you that know not what spirit you are of; who call yourselves of a catholic spirit only because you are of a muddy understanding; you think you are got into the very spirit of Christ, when in truth you are nearer the spirit of Antichrist."—*Rowland Hill's Full Answer to J. Wesley*, p. 40, 41.

But the question is now asked, are we not to follow our feelings as a guide? I answer yes, if they agree with the Bible; but positive law must be obeyed, at the expense of all feelings beside. Thus Abraham in offering his Isaac, Gen. xxii. 2—14, and thus Christ taught, Matt. xix. 29, "If any man will come after me, let him *deny himself*, and take up his cross," &c., but what *self-denial* is there in following your own feelings?

But can we not take conscience for a guide? I answer, what is conscience, but a creature of education? The Hindoo mother gives her infant to the wheels of Juggernaut to satisfy her conscience, while the Christian mother would act exactly opposite to please hers. Thus conscience measures our actions, and declares them good or bad, in view of some received rule; but in order to have a good conscience we must take God's word for the standard. Heb. xiii. 18.

But are we not to follow our own understanding or reason? I answer, the use of these in religion is to discern between truth and error. Eph. v. 7, "Wherefore be not unwise, but *understanding what the will of the Lord is*." Prov. iii. 5, "Trust in the Lord with all thy heart, and lean not unto *thine own understanding*." Prov. ix. 10: Job xxviii. 28: xxxiv. 16.

But are we to follow the Spirit of God? I answer yes, Rom. viii. 14, "For as many as are led by the

Spirit of God, they are the sons of God." But, 1 Cor. iii. 18, "Let no man deceive himself." 1 John iv. 1, "But try the spirits whether they are of God;" and as, 2 Tim. iii. 16, "All scripture is given by inspiration of God," and is a complete rule of faith and practice, the Bible is the standard by which we are to try the spirits that influence us. Isa. viii. 20.

But it is plead that we can not all understand the Bible alike. "It is an essential article that the *words* of the laws excite in every body the same ideas. The laws ought not to be subtle, for they are designed for common understanding; not as an art of logic, but as the plain reason of a father to a family."—*Barron Montesquieu, Spirit of Laws, book 29, p. 16.*

Now is it probable that our heavenly Father would give us laws that we cannot understand, and then call us to an account for disobedience? See Acts xvii. 30: Lev. iv. 2: and v. 15: Isa. liii. 8: Eph. iv. 18: 1st Cor. iii. 12—15: John vii. 17: the confusion concerning Baptism, the Lord Supper &c., exists because the *leaders* have taken liberty to change God's ordinances, and puzzle the people with sophistry.

"The Church of Rome frankly acknowledges, by her delegates assembled in the council of Trent, that our sovereign Lord, when he instituted the Holy Supper, administered in both kinds, and that it was so administered for some time. She however expressly claims an authority to dispense with that order." See council of Trent, Session 21, Chapters 1—3.

"Wherefore the church did great liberty to herself since the beginning, to change the rites somewhat, excepting the substance. Some dipped them thrice, some but once; wherefore there is no cause why we should be so straight laced in matters which are of no such weight."—*John Calvin's comment on Acts viii. 38.*

"Every particular church may *ordain, change or*

abolish rites and ceremonies, so that all things may be done to edification.”—*Methodist Epis. Discipline, Article of Religion 22.*

“The heifer, whose ashes were to make the waters of separation, (Num. xix. 2,) the color was no circumstance: but, made by God’s command a substantial part of the service; to be red was as much as to be a heifer—for though the things in themselves be small, yet *His authority* is great. If any of Christ’s institutions seem necessary to be broken, it will be necessary first, to decry them as *poor, low, inconsiderable, circumstantial*, and fill the people’s heads with a noise and din that Christ lays little stress on them; and in order hereto, call them *non-essentials*, the *accidentals*, the *minutes*, so that the conscience may not kick at condemning them.”—*Vincent Alsop’s Sober Enquiry*, p. 289.

“Positive duties stand on a *moral foot*. To obey God, in whatever he commands is the first moral law, and the fundamental principle of all morality.”—*Dr. Waterland’s Scripture Vindication part 3. p. 37.*

SECTION II.

I HAVE been amused to see how pedobaptists attempt to prove their scheme. They will first affirm that infant sprinkling is *lawful*; when we tell them that the Pope has no control over this land, and that the law of New England which enforced pedobaptism is repealed, therefore this argument is not adapted to this country, they will then *assert* that the Scriptures prove *infant sprinkling right*. Thus, the word *infant* is found at Isa. lxv. 20: Job iii. 16: and Luke xviii. 15: and *Sprinkle* at Ex. ix. 8: Ez. xxxvi. 25: and Heb. x. 22: and the word *right* at Gen. xviii. 25: and Amos v. xii: therefore the Bible proves *Infant*

sprinkling right. They will next *assert*, infants are church members, and therefore subjects of baptism; and to prove this, they say, that infants by God's appointment, were made members of the Jewish church; and the law, authorizing their membership, has not been *abrogated*. This argument reminds me of Mr. John Cotton's* reply to Roger Williams; About A. D. 1651 Mr. Williams complained of the deadly persecutions that he was suffering from Mr. Cotton, and said that the civil sword was not appointed as a remedy in such cases: to which Mr. Cotton replied. "It is evident that the civil sword was appointed as a remedy in this case, Deut. xiii, and appointed it was by the Angel of God's presence, whom God promised to send with his people, Ex. xxxiii. 2—3, and that Angel was Christ, 1st Cor. x. 9, therefore it cannot be said that the Lord Jesus never appointed the civil sword as a remedy in such cases, for he did expressly appoint it in the Old Testament, *nor did he ever abrogate it in the New.* *Thou shalt surely kill him because he hath sought to thrust thee away from the Lord thy God.* This reason is moral, that is, of universal and perpetual equity, to *put to death* any apostate, seducing idolater or heretic."—*Backus' History, Vol 1, p. 165, 166.*

This is the very course that Mr. Sawyer has taken to prove sprinkling and infant church membership; for thus he says, "Moses adopted washing as a Jewish rite, and John the Baptist adopted the same *Mosaic* washing. The seal of the Abrahamic covenant was circumcision, and not only Abraham, but his seed were initiated into the church by it. Paul baptized disciples, and Christ took little children in his arms and blessed them. The church under the Old Testament economy, recognized their infants as members, and infant church membership has not been *ab-*

*A celebrated Congregational minister.

rogated in the New; therefore infant baptism is fully proved." When Mr. Sawyer takes Mr. Cotton's civil sword, and compels us to believe his *logic sound*, we shall say amen, to his assertions, and not before. Take a parallel to Messrs. Cotton and Sawyer's arguments; Mark x. 13—16. They brought young children to Christ, and he took them up in his arms and blessed them, (which must have been done by speaking to them;) but Jesus Christ was *God*; Isa. ix. 6: and John x. 35, he called them *Gods* unto whom the word of God came. What must each of these children have been therefore? But few men are sensible how far a *subtle* infidel, or a *designing* learned *Christian* can *wrest* the Scriptures without detection, until they have carefully compared their writings with the inspired text.

SECTION III.

The Baptism of John.

1. The testimony of our Lord.

John i. 6, "There was a man sent from God, whose name was John." Luke iii. 3, "And he came into all the country about Jordan, preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins." Mark i. 1, 2, "The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, as it is written in the prophets, behold I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee." Matt. iii. 5, 6, "Then went out to him Jerusalem, and all Judea, and the region round about Jordan, and were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins." John well understood his commission; he was sent to prepare a people for the Lord, (i. e. for the Lord's church.) He therefore, in accordance with his commission, required of the people

1. *Confession of sin.* Matt. iii. 6: Mark, i. 5.
2. *Repentance.* Matt. iii. 2: Mark i. 4: Luke iii. 8, &c.

3. *Faith* in Jesus Christ. Acts xix. 4: Matt. iii. 11: Mark i. 7, 8: Luke iii. 15—18: Acts xiii. 25: John i. 29: Mark i. 15, &c. And those who would not comply with these conditions he did not baptize, but rebuked them sharply for offering themselves as candidates for baptism, while unprepared. Matt. iii. 7—12: Luke iii. 7—14. But, with these facts before him, Mr. Sawyer says, p. 2, "Whether the children of believers were included with their parents among the subjects of John's baptism, we are not particularly informed;" but if Mr. Sawyer has failed to discover that infants are not capable of *faith, repentance, and confession of sin*, I am happy that many of his pedobaptist brethren have honestly confessed that all the subjects of John's baptism were *adult Christians*. I could quote hundreds, but these few must suffice.

2. Pedobaptist testimony.

"John Baptist admitted men to baptism, confessing and bewailing their sins."—*Cambridge Platform, chapt. 12, sec. 2.*

"*Adult Jews*, professing repentance, and a disposition to become Messiah's subjects, were the *only* persons, as far as we can find, whom John admitted to his baptism."—*Dr. Scott's Family Bible.*

"ORIGEN says we ought necessarily to observe that both St. Matthew and St. Mark say that upon *confession* of their sins, all Jerusalem, &c., were baptized."—*Dr. Gale's Reflections, p. 385.*

The disinterested testimony of the great Jewish historian is important: "John, that was called the Baptist, was a good man, and commanded the Jews to exercise virtue, both as to righteousness toward one another and piety toward God, and *so to come to baptism*; for that the washing would be acceptable to Him, if they made use of it, not in order to the putting away of some sins, but for the purification of the

body, *supposing still that the soul was thoroughly purified beforehand by righteousness.*"—*Josephus' Antiquities*, book 18, chapt. 5, sec. 2.

SECTION IV.

The Baptism of our Savior.

That the Lord was baptized is evident, from Matt. iii. 13—17: Mark i. 9—12: Luke iii. 21, 22: John i. 31—34. Thus we have the Savior's *example* in this institution; but it is abundantly evident that he never did *practice* baptism, from the fact that there is no record of it, and because the Holy Spirit says expressly, John iv. 2, "*Jesus himself baptized not.*" This is fatal to all the pedobaptist volumes written to prove that Christ *baptized infants*; and as Dr. Taylor says, when remarking upon Matt. xix. 13—15: Mark x. 13—16: Luke xviii. 15—17, "Using these words to prove infant baptism, proves nothing so much as the *want* of a better argument."—*Dr. Jeremy Taylor*.

Having noticed the example and practice of the Lord, we pass to his *commands*. Matthew xxviii. 19, 20, "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." Mark xvi. 16, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not, shall be damned." The last dying words of a friend, sink deep into the hearts of survivors. The Savior regarding this fact, purposely reserved the law of preaching and baptizing, for the last, and with well selected words, arranged in an *order* which strictly agrees with the gospel economy, he pronounced the *command*, and ascended to his throne in the heavens. I am happy that Mr. Saw-

yer has saved his friends from that mortification which they must have felt, had he attempted to prove infant baptism from this scripture. He frankly says, (p. 6,) "The *first* thing commanded, is to *proselyte* all nations to the Christian religion. The *second* is to *baptize* them, and the *third* and last thing, here enjoined is, to *teach* them to observe all the ordinances of Christ." "The action is baptizing or *immersing* in water. The subjects thereof, those persons of every nation, whom the ministers can by their instructions, render disciples, that is, such as do sincerely believe the truth."—*Dr. Barrow's works, Vol. 1 p. 518.*

"In the primitive church, instruction preceded baptism, agreeable to the *order* of Jesus Christ, go teach unto all nations, baptizing them."—*Saurin's Sermons, vol. 1, p. 301.*

"Because Christ requires teaching before baptism, and will have believers ONLY admitted to baptism, baptism does not seem to be rightly administered except faith precedes."—*John Calvin, Harmony of the Evangelists.*

"They could not make disciples unless by teaching. By that institution were disciples brought to the faith before they were baptized."—*Limborch's Institutes, chapt. 67, p. 7.*

"Matt. xxviii. 19, Go ye, therefore, &c. This is not like some occasional historical mention of baptism, but is the *very commission of Christ* to his apostles, and *purposely expresseth* their several works in their several places and orders. The first work is by *teaching* to make disciples, which are called by Mark, xvi. 16, *believers*. Their second work is to *baptize* them; the third work is to teach them all other things which are to be learned in the school of Christ. To condemn this order, is to *renounce all rules of order*; for where can we expect to find it if not here. I profess my con-

science fully satisfied from this text that it is one sort of faith, *even saving*, that *must* go before baptism."—*Barter's Disp. of right to sacraments*, pp. 149, 150.

"A limited commission implies a *prohibition* of such things as are not contained in it, and positive laws imply their **NEGATIVE**."—*Appendix to Walker's Debate*, p. 209.

Therefore, when the Lord commanded his disciples to baptize believers, and the commission ceasing there, it was precisely the same as forbidding them to baptize infants and unbelievers; and Abraham could as well expect to please God by circumcising females, or infants *before* they were eight days old, as pedobaptists by sprinkling infants *before* they believe in Christ.

But the question arises, was *John's baptism* and *Christian baptism* the same. Pedobaptists have asserted that they were not, because they know that John uniformly *immersed*; therefore they try to destroy his baptism altogether, that there may be less scripture to oppose their sprinkling. Thus Mr. Sawyer asserts, p. 2, 3, "The first notice of Christian baptism, and *all* the notice of it which occurs in the gospel history previous to the crucifixion, is in the following passages: John iii. 22—26: John iv. 1, 2." Now what a *shameless* statement this is; that Christian baptism, which derived both its existence and *name* from Jesus Christ, did not exist until administered by the disciples, long after the Lord was baptized. The identity of Christian and John's baptism is evident from Scripture; see Matt. xi. 7—15: Mark i. 1—8: Luke iii. 3—6: Acts i. 21—23: Rom. vi. 4, 5: Eph. iv. 3—6: Col. ii. 12; and is conceded by able pedobaptists. "By this he intended to do an honor to John's ministry, and conform himself to what he appointed to his followers."—*Dr. Doddridge's Note on Mark 1, 9*.

"In John's preaching and *baptizing*, there was the beginning of the gospel *doctrines and ordinances*, and the first fruits of them."—*Dr. M. Henry's Comment on Mark i. 1.*

"It is certain that the ministry of John was *precisely the same* as that which was afterward committed to the apostles.——The sameness of their doctrine *shows their baptism to have been the same.* I grant that the baptism which they (the twelve, at Acts xix. 1—7,) had received was the true baptism of John, and the *very same with the baptism of Christ*; but I deny that they were baptized again."—*Calvin's Institutes, book 4, chapt. 15, sec. 7, 8.*

"I must say a few words in support of the identity of these baptisms. The baptism of *John* and the baptism of *Christ* were the same in their divine origin; and the same as it respects the element, and the mode of applying it. In both, the parties baptized did profess their faith in Christ; Acts xix. 4, and also their repentance, Luke iii. 3. The baptism of John was the baptism of the gospel. It was in practice after 'the beginning of the gospel.' Mark i. 1. It testified of Christ *actually come.* The Prophets prophesied, and the ceremonial law was in force *until John*, Matt. xi. 13. In him they were fulfilled. And in him, of course, the shadows ceased. Hence it is obvious that John's baptism was a New Testament rite. But the baptism of the New Testament "is one," Eph. iv. 5. Therefore the baptism of John and of Christ are the same. Some critics have conceived that they have discovered proofs of John's disciples having *again been baptized.* But there is no evidence of this in the New Testament. In Acts xix. 1—6, the inquiry which St. Paul made of the disciples was *not* whether they were baptized, but whether '*they had received the Holy Ghost*,' i. e. in his miraculous gifts, since they believed. Water baptism was not the subject of

the conference; and, upon hearing their answer that 'they had not so much as heard of the outpouring of the Holy Ghost,' Paul laid his hands upon them and the Holy Ghost came upon them. The 5th verse is not a part of the narrative of St. Luke. It is the continuation of St. Paul's address; and what his disciples did. 'When they,' the disciples of John, 'heard this,' i. e. John's doctrine respecting Christ, 'they were baptized,' i. e. by John, 'in the name of Christ.' This is the opinion of the ablest critics and fathers of the reformation. *Turretine* on the identity of the two baptisms, vol. 3, p. 444. *Ber. de Moore*, vol. v, pp. 396—402; vol. vi. p. 802; and on the last point see *Tur.* iii. p. 448: *Beza Marnizius, Coccius, &c. J. Mark*, Medul. and Comp. in *B. D. Moore*, vol. v. p. 401, &c., who gives Mark's four arguments against the anabaptism of John's disciples.

Dilemma 1. 'If the baptism of John was not the baptism of the New Testament, then our Lord was not baptized—and hence he wanted that toward the New Testament church, which, by circumcision, he had toward the Old Testament church.

2. 'Hence the argument of St. Paul is evaded, One Lord, one faith, one baptism.' Our Lord had not one of the bonds of union and communion said here to exist between each saint and himself.

3. 'Hence there can be no meaning in our Lord's words when he came to be baptized. If not of the New Testament, it could not be a part of his righteousness to be fulfilled.' See also Dr. Lightfoot, vol. 1, p. 467."—*Dr. Wm. C. Brownlee, work against the religious principles of the Quakers.*

Such is the language of the well informed part of the pedobaptist community; and thus clear it is, from reason and revelation, that Christian baptism is the same, whether administered by John the Baptist, Paul the apostle, or a Christian minister of the 19th century.

SECTION V.

The baptism of the Apostles.

THE Acts of the Apostles, written by Luke, is the first book of Baptist church history, and of course, it is needless to look for any intimations of infant baptism here; for "they baptized only the adult or aged, whether Jews or Gentiles, whereof we have instances in Acts ii., viii., x., xvi., and xix.; but as to the baptizing of infants, we have no example. As to the manner of baptizing, it was by *dipping* or plunging into water, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, according to the allusions contained in Rom. vi. and Col. ii."—*Magdeburg Centuriators*.

The first account of baptism administered, excepting by John the Baptist, is at John iii. 22—26, and iv. 1, 2. With reference to these passages, Mr. Sawyer says, page 3, that "nothing is said respecting the children of believers, and the *omission of any notice of them*," &c. The next passage noticed by Mr. Sawyer is Acts ii. 37—40, by which he thinks infant baptism is sustained; but he has evidently mistaken the sense of the text in the following particulars.

1. He wholly mistakes the meaning of the word *children*, in the 39th verse; *τεκνους* is a noun derived from the verb *τικτω*, and is the dative plural of *τεκνον*. That it does not mean infants, is clear, from the following facts. The Greeks have three words which they use with reference to their posterity, *βεβηκος*, (*habe*) see Luke i. 41, 44, and Luke ii. 12, 16; *παιδιον* (*child*) see Matthew ii. 8, and John xxi. 5; and *τεκνον* (*son or daughter*.) the meaning of which can be learned from those texts where it is used. See Matt. x. 21: xv. 26: xxi. 28: Mark vii. 27: x. 24: xiii. 12: Luke i. 17: ii. 48: xv. 31: Acts ii. 39: v. 21: 2 Cor. vi. 13: Eph. vi. 1: Col. iii. 20: 1 Thess. ii. 11: Titus i. 6: 2

John i. 4. Now every English scholar can see that Mr. Sawyer was mistaken in the meaning of the word, and all learned pedobaptists are against him. "By *τεκνα* the Apostle understands, not infants, but children or posterity.—Whence it appears that the argument which is very commonly taken from this passage for the baptism of infants, is of no force, and good for nothing, because it certainly departs from the design of Peter."—*Limborch's Comment on Acts ii. 39.*

"If any have made use of that very unconvincing argument, (Acts ii. 39,) I have nothing to say in defense of them. I think that the word children there, is really the *posterity* of the Jews, and *not* peculiarly their *infant* children."—*Dr. Hammond's Works, Vol. 1, p. 490.*

"The opinion of those who maintain that the Jewish rites were adopted every where in the Christian churches; by order of the apostles or their disciples, is destitute of all foundation."—*Moshiem's Ch. Hist., Part 1, Chapt. 4.*

Mr. Sawyer's second error has reference to the promised blessing. He would make it read, "for the promise of *baptism* is to you and your children," whereas the Spirit's sanctifying and saving influences are evidently meant. "Considering that the gift of the Spirit had been mentioned just before, it seems most natural to interpret this as a reference to that passage in Joel, which had been so largely cited above, verses 17, &c., where God promised the effusions of the Spirit on his sons and daughters."—*Dr. Doddridge's note on Acts ii. 39.*

"These words will not prove a right of infants to receive baptism, the promise here being that of the Holy Ghost, mentioned ver. 16—18; and so relating to the times of the miraculous effusion of the Holy Ghost, and to those persons who by age were made

capable of these extraordinary gifts.”—*Dr. Whitley, Annot. on Acts ii. 39.*

The third mistake of Mr. Sawyer is that he makes the word *call*, in the text, to mean simply hearing the gospel preached, p. 7, “*all, however remote, to whom the gospel may be preached ;*” whereas the word *call* is used here in the same sense as at Romans viii. 30. “Moreover, whom he did predestinate, them he also *called*, and whom he *called*, them he also justified, and whom he justified, them he also glorified.” See also Rom. i. 6: viii. 28: ix. 24: 1 Cor. i. 24. “To this general, the following limitation must refer: Even as many of them, as many particular persons in each nation, as the Lord our God shall *call effectually into fellowship of Jesus Christ.*”—*Dr. M. Henry, Expos. of Acts ii. 39.*

“Baptism is, as it were, the appendix to faith, and therefore posterior in order; and then if it be administered without faith, of which it is a seal, it is both an injurious and gross profanation.”—*John Calvin, Comment. on Acts viii. 36.*

I would say it pleasantly, yet I do say it *positively*, that Mr. Sawyer knew he was not giving the true sense of Acts ii. 37—40. Will he baptize all who ever heard him “*preach the gospel?*” If not, he condemns his own theory.

Mr. Sawyer lays much stress on the three *household baptisms*, which he names, Acts xvi. 25—34, the Jailor, Acts xvi 14—15 Lydia, and 1st Cor. i. 16 Stephanas; but as believing precedes baptism, we shall deviate a little from his course, and inquire first for household faith. The *first* household of faith that we shall mention, is that of Zacharias, Luke i. 5—7, “and they were both righteous before God;” the *second* is at John iv. 53, “And himself believed, and his whole house;” the *third* is at John xi. 5, “Now Jesus

loved Martha and her sister Mary and Lazarus ;” the *fourth* is that of Cornelius, Acts x. 2, and xi. 14, “A devout man, and one that feared God with all his house——Thou and all thy house shall be saved.” “In the first plantation of Christianity among the Gentiles, such *only* as were of full age, after they were instructed in the principles of the Christian religion, were admitted to baptism.” See Wall’s Hist. of Infant baptism, Vol. 2, Chapt. 2, Sec. 14.

The *fifth*, is at Acts xvi. 14—40. “Lydia, a seller of purple, of the city of Thyatira, which worshiped God——and entered into the house of Lydia ; and when they had seen the brethren, they comforted them.” “Whether she was a Jewess or Gentile we know not ; but she and her family being converted to, and baptized in the Christian faith, Paul upon her entreaty, lodged at her house. Acts xvi. 14—40.”—*Brown’s Bible Dictionary, at Lydia.*

“Whose heart the Lord opened ; as she was a sincere worshiper of God, she was prepared to receive the heavenly truths spoken by Paul and his companion ; she believed them, and received them as the doctrines of God ; and in *this faith*, she was joined by her *whole family*, and in it they were *all baptized*.—*Dr. A. Clark’s comment on Acts xvi.*

The *sixth*, is that of the Jailor, Acts xvi. 25—34, who “rejoiced, *believing* in God with *all his house* ;” “and was *baptized*, he and *all his*.”

“Luke commends the pious zeal of the jailor, because he dedicated his whole house to the Lord, in which also the grace of God illustriously appeared, because it suddenly brought the *whole family* to a pious consent.”—*John Calvin’s comment on Acts xvi. 25—34.*

“There was none in the house that refused to be baptized, and so made a jar in the ceremony ; but they were unanimous in *embracing the gospel*, which added

much to the joy.”—*Dr. M. Henry’s comment on Acts xvi. 25—34.*

“Receiving instruction embraced this doctrine, and showed the *sincerity of their faith* by immediately receiving baptism.”—*Dr. A. Clark’s comment on Acts xvi. 25—34.*

The *seventh* household of faith, is at Acts xviii. 8; “And Crispus, the chief ruler of the synagogue, believed on the Lord, with all his house.”

The *eighth*, is that of Acts xviii. 2—26; “Aquila, born in Pontas, lately come from Italy with his wife Priscilla——whom when Aquila and Priscilla had heard, they took him unto them, and expounded unto him the way of God.”

“They took him (Apollus) with them to *their house* and there explained to him the way of God, in a more complete and perfect manner.”—*Dr. Doddridge’s comment on Acts xviii. 26.*

The *ninth* is at 1 Cor. i. 16: xvi. 15: “And I baptized the household of Stephanas——ye know the house of Stephanas, that it is the first fruits of Achaia, and that *they* have addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints.”

“And I further beseech you, my brethren, that for as much as ye know the household of Stephanas, that it is the first fruits of Achaia, *he and they* being among the first that were converted to Christianity in all your country——this seems to imply that it was the generous care of the whole family, to assist their fellow Christians; so that there was not a member of it, which did not do his part.”—*Dr. Doddridge’s comment and note on 1 Cor. xvi. 15.*

Now Mr. Sawyer thinks that *three* of the above named families were baptized. Well sir, suppose they *all* were; did they do more than their duty? There are now eleven whole households of communicants in the First Baptized Church in this city, which are two

more than we find in the Bible, except there were whole families baptized with the 5000 men, Acts iv. 4.

Driven to the last extremity, Mr. Sawyer has confessed, pp. 2, 3, that there is no scripture precept or example for infant baptism; and to gloss his opposite *assertions*, he attempts to make out a warrant for the practice, with the following beggarly arguments: p. 3, "The incidental manner in which the subject (baptism) is referred to, and the brevity of the reference, preclude the mention of infants." But why were the Scriptures made so contracted? It could not have been for the want of ink, paper, or time, that they made but such *incidental* and *limited* records of baptism; for the ordinance is spoken of 72 times in the New Testament, and the word infant, including its correlatives, occurs 627 times in the Bible. Thus, child 81 times, children 391, sucklings 7, babe 13, infants 5, offspring 11, seed 119; and in each of these 627 places, the subject matter of record is of less importance than Mr. Sawyer makes infant baptism, when he says, p. 19, "The blessings of that covenant (of grace) are *forfeited* by a neglect to practice infant baptism."

It is a reasonable thought, that in the hundreds of instances where these words are used, *even chance* would have thrown infant and baptism together, had not *design* kept them asunder; but no such instance occurs. When children are meant to be included in commands, or the narration of facts, they are expressly mentioned. See Dent. ii. 34: xxxi. 12: 1st Sam. xv. 3: xxii. 19: Est. iii. 13: viii. 11: Jer. xl. 7: Matt. x. 21: xiv. 21. But where children are not included they are not mentioned. See Ex. xxxv. 22: Acts i. 14: v. 14: viii. 3—12: ix. 2: xiii. 50: xvii. 4—12: xxii. 4. Had Luke been a pedobaptist, he would have said, Acts viii. 12, "They were baptized, both men and women," (and children,) and the *brevity* of the re-

ference would not have prevented, if the Holy Ghost had thus dictated. It is therefore obvious, that God has immutably separated the words infant and baptism.

Another of Mr. Sawyer's arguments is, pp. 18, 19, that God gave to Jewish infants the rite of circumcision, therefore there *must* be a corresponding rite to our infants. "But for that kind of arguing, that God has been wanting to us in his institutions, if he has not instituted this or that, and therefore he has instituted it, I leave to those whose conclusions need it; very much desiring them to consider what a cause that must be, which drives them to such *bold reasonings* as these are."—*Dr. Clugget's preservative against Popery*, Title 7, p. 93.

Another of Mr. Sawyer's arguments is this. Page 5, "Faith is the duty of adults, not of infants, therefore the want of it in the case of the latter cannot lay them under any moral disabilities, or be any obstacle to their baptism." "I reply, neither were the Jews forbidden to circumcise females. Besides, we are not expressly forbidden to baptize unbelievers, nor our meeting houses and bells; but will it do hence to baptize them. Surely this kind of reasoning will not do."—*J. Chadwick on bapt.* p. 128.

Another of his arguments is, page 4, "The rule observed in respect to infants, whether in favor of baptizing them or not, and many other things relative to baptism, not expressly recorded, were no doubt clearly explained by Christ, and perfectly understood at the time by his disciples; these primitive explanations are *now lost*."

"This has always appeared to me, ground, hardly consistent with manly fairness and candor, and calculated to enfeeble rather than strengthen; to expose to a *sneer*, rather than recommend to acceptance, the cause it is meant to support."—*Dr. Wardlaw on Bapt.*, p. 19.

When Capt. Symms declared that this earth was hollow, and inhabited inside as well as out, if he had been informed that this account of the world was not recorded in the Bible, we presume he would have said, all these things "were no doubt clearly explained by Christ, and perfectly understood by Moses; but these primitive explanations are *now lost*."

It may satisfy the ignorant, to tell them that the New Testament is so brief a work, that the Holy Spirit could not mention infants in the 72 instances where it speaks of baptism; or that the law of infant baptism was undoubtedly given, *but is now lost*. But men of erudition must look upon such statements, as a burlesque on common sense. What Romish tradition, what *heresy* could we not support in this way. Isa. viii. 20.

Pedobaptists formerly plead; that *their* children were holy, and therefore ought to be baptized; (Presbyterian confession of faith, p. 336,) but this argument is becoming stale and obsolete. However, it is well to notice the texts of Scripture which they have urged to prove their doctrine. Rom. xi. 16, "If the root be holy, so are the branches." The argument made from this text and its connexion, is briefly this. Because *we*, the root, are holy, *our children*, the branches are holy; and because our children are *holy*, they ought to be baptized. But still, they do not admit these *holy baptized infant church members* to the Lord's Supper, and other church privileges; evidently making a *difference* which the Apostle strictly forbids at Rom. x. 12: Gal. iii. 26—29. "For there is *no difference*, &c.—For as many as have *been baptized* into Christ, have put on Christ; there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female; for ye are *all one* in Christ Jesus. And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise."

The other text urged to this end, is 1 Cor. vii. 14. "The unbelieving husband, is sanctified by the wife; and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband. Else were your children unclean; but now are they holy." To plead that holiness is generated with our being, is to overthrow the doctrine of regeneration, and stands opposed to Gen. vi. 5—12: Psa. li. 5: Job xiv. 4: Psa. lvi. 3: Isa. xlviii. 8: Rom. iii. 10—18: John iii. 3—10: Rom. v. 12: "As by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned"—"All are born with a sinful nature——there has never been one instance of an immaculate human soul, since the fall of Adam. Through his transgression *all come into the world* with the seeds of death and corruption in their own nature; all are sinful—all are mortal—all must die."—*Dr. A. Clark's comment on Rom. v. 12, 13.*

"Original sin is the fault and corruption of the nature of every man, and therefore, in every person born into this world, it deserveth God's wrath."—*Church of Eng. Conf. of Faith, Art. 9.*

"Original sin standeth not in the following of Adam, (as the Pelagians do vainly talk,) but it is the corruption of the *nature of every man*, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam, whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and of his own nature inclined to evil, and that continually."—*Epis. Meth. Disc. Art. of Rel. 7.*

But if the infants of believers were really sinless, there is no better authority for baptizing them, than, "The infants of one or both believing parents are to be baptized, and these only."—*Saybrook Platform, chapt. 29, sec. 4.*

"I think Dr. Reynolds, in his meditations on the Lord's Supper, has summarily exposed the common judgment of Calvinists in these strong lines of his.

The sacrament is but a seal of the covenant, and the covenant essentially includes conditions, and the condition on our part is faith. *No faith, no covenant ; no covenant, no seal ; no seal, no sacrament.*—*Pres. Edwards' Works, vol. 4, p. 435.*

In view of these facts, if your minister says you should have your children baptized *because they are in the covenant*, just ask him what covenant.

“ We can not allow that *baptized infants* whether sanctified or unsanctified, belong to the visible church ; for 1, they can not belong to it by virtue of their own act, for they can neither make nor accept any proposals ; 2, they can not belong to it by virtue of their parents' act ; believing parents can not covenant with God for them——, (and) in stating the nature of covenanting, we have endeavored to prove that it lies not within the province of Divine sovereignty to take any of the human race into covenant, without their *own personal* knowledge and consent.”—*Dr. Emmon's work, and Mather's Magnalia*, p. 19.

By examining the following references, the candid inquirer will be fully satisfied that infant baptism makes no part of Divine record.

1. John's baptism ; Matt. iii. 1—16 : xxi. 25 : Mark i. 1—6 : xi. 31—33 : Luke iii. 3—22 : xx. 4—8 : John i. 28—31 : Acts i. 5—22 : x. 37 : xiii. 24 : xviii. 25 : xix. 1—7.

2. The baptism of Jesus Christ ; Matt. iii. 13—17 ; Mark i. 9—11 : Luke iii. 21, 22 : John i. 32—34.

3. Christ baptizing by his disciples in Judea ; John iii. 22—26 : iv. 1—3.

4. John's last baptizing in Enon ; John iii. 23.

5. An account of John's success ; Luke vii. 29, 30.

6. Christ's sufferings represented under the figure of baptism ; Matt. xx. 22, 23 : Luke xii. 50.

7. Our Lord's commission ; Matt. xxviii. 18—20 : Mark xvi. 15, 16.

8. Baptism at the Pentecost; Acts ii. 37-42.
9. Phillip's baptizing; Acts viii. 12, 13.
10. The eunuch's baptism; Acts viii. 36-39.
11. The baptism of St. Paul; Acts ix. 17, 18: xxii. 16: Rom. vi. 3-5.
12. The baptism of Cornelius and friends: Acts x. 37-48.
13. The baptism of Lydia and her household: Acts xvi. 13-15.
14. Baptism of the jailer and his household; Acts xvi. 29-34.
15. Paul's baptizing at Corinth; Acts xviii. 8: 1 Cor. i. 13-17: xvi. 15.
16. Instances where the word is used, from which some light may be gathered. Col. ii. 12: Eph. iv. 5: 1 Cor. xii. 13: xv. 29: Gal. iii. 27: Heb. vi. 1, 2: 1 Cor. x. 1, 2: 1 Peter iii. 20, 21.

And to assist the reader while he investigates the sacred Scriptures, we will lay before him some comments from the most eminent *pedobaptist* divines.

"It is evident from the addresses of the different inspired Epistles, what manner of persons they were, who ought to have been received and retained as members. They are *beloved of God; called to be saints; sanctified in Christ Jesus; saints and faithful in Christ Jesus*. Such as had obtained the like precious faith with the Apostles.—Rom. i. 7: Eph. i. 1: 2 Peter i. 1, &c."—*Wardlaw on bapt.* p. 145.

"All traces of infant baptism which one will find in the New Testament, must first be put into it. Our creeds treat of it, without regard to history, and attempt to justify it in itself. But the manner in which they do it is unsatisfactory, and upon grounds that essentially destroy each other."—*Schleiermacher's Theology*, p. 383.

"Regeneration is the thing, without which, a title

to the sacraments is not to be pretended."—*Cotton Mather, in Backus' Ch. hist. vol. 2, p. 1, 2.*

"Formerly no person was brought to the holy baptism till he was of adult age, and when he both understood what that mystical water meant, and desired to be washed in it."—*Ludovicus Vives' com., Lib. 1, chapt. 27.*

"All attempts to make out infant baptism from the New Testament, fail. It is totally opposed to the spirit of the Apostolic age, and to the fundamental principles of the New Testament."—*Prof. Lange's work on bapt. p. 101.*

"The primitive church did not baptize infants, and the learned Grotius proves it in his Annotations on the Gospels."—*Stennett's answer to Russen, p. 188.*

"Rheinhard, Morus, and Doderlein, say infant baptism is not to be found in the Bible."—*Bretschneider's Theology, vol. 2, p. 758.*

"It cannot be proved by the sacred Scriptures, that infant baptism was instituted by Christ, or begun by the first Christians after the Apostles."—*M. Luther in Booth Pedo. exam. Vol. 2, p. 4.*

"Baptism obligates a man to a Christian life; But how can one who is unconscions, (an infant,) obligate himself to any thing."—*Hase's Theology, p. 449.*

"The baptism then used by John, and Christ's disciples, was only the baptism of repentance, and faith in the Messiah which was for to come; (Acts xix. 4,) of both which, infants were incapable."—*Whitby's Anno. on Matt. xix. 13, 14.*

"There is not a single example to be found in the New Testament, where infants were baptized."—*Starke's hist. of infant bapt. p. 11.*

"Children are not expressly mentioned in the command to baptize, or in the accounts of baptisms, contained in the New Testament."—*Dr. Wood's Lect. on bapt., p. 107.*

"Christian baptism can be given only to adults, not to infants.—*Prof. Linder on the Supper*, p. 123.

"As to the baptism of infants, it is a mere human tradition, for which neither precept nor practice is to be found in all the Scriptures."—*R. Barklay (Quaker) Apology*, p. 409.

"A Congregational church, is by the institution of Christ, a part of the militant visible church, consisting of a company of *saints by calling*, united in one body by an holy covenant.——The things which are requisite to be found in all church members, are *repentance from sin, and faith in Jesus Christ.*" *Cambridge Platform*, chapt. 2, sect. 6, and chapt. 12, sec. 2.

"The visible church of Christ, is a congregation of *faithful men*, in which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments duly administered according to Christ's ordinance." *Epis. Meth. disci. Art. of Relig.* 13.

The above rather disproves infant church membership. As infant baptism is not a Bible doctrine, when was it originated?

To show this, we will notice the church which invented it. Dr. Moshien says, "The greatest part of the Christians who lived in Palestine, to prevent their being confounded with the Jews, abandoned entirely the Mosaic rites, and chose a bishop named Mark, a foreigner by nation.——This step was highly shocking to those whose attachment to the Mosaic rites was violent.——These, therefore separated themselves from the brethren, and formed at Pera, a country of Palestine, and in the neighboring parts, particular assemblies, in which the law of Moses maintained its primitive dignity, authority and luster. This body of *Judaizing Christians*, which set *Moses and Christ* upon equal foot in point of authority, was afterwards divided into two sects——distinguished by the names

of Nazarenes and Ebionites.——They (Ebionites) moreover asserted that the ceremonial law instituted by Moses was not only obligatory upon the Jews, but also *upon all others*, and that the observance of it was essential to salvation.——They went still farther, and received with an equal degree of veneration the *superstitions* of their ancestors, and the ceremonies and *traditions* which the Pharisees presumptuously added to the law.——Cerdo the Cyrian, and Marcion the son of the bishop of Pontus, belonged to the Asiatic sect, though they began to establish their doctrine at Rome.——Valentine——his sect, which took its rise in Rome, grew up to a state of consistency and vigor, in the isle of Cyprus, and spread itself through Asia, Africa, and Europe.——These were succeeded by one in which ignorance reigned, and which was the mortal enemy of philosophy and letters. It was formed by Montanus, an obscure man, without capacity or strength of judgment, and who lived in a Phrygian village called *Pepuza*. This weak man was foolish and extravagant enough to take it into his head that he was the Paraclete or Comforter which the Divine Savior——promised to send to his disciples.”
—*Moshiem's Ch. Hist. cent. 2, part 2, chap. 3—5.*

This Pepuzian branch of the Ebionite Gnostics, continued to exist as a little corrupt church, and in A. D. 204, we find it conducted by several prophetesses, or *female bishops*, of whom Quintillia was chief; hence they were commonly called Quintillianists; but they denominated themselves Artotyrites, (bread and cheese eaters.) It was in this church, and at this time, that *children's* baptism was invented, and it was this Quintillia, who wrote to Tertulian, inquiring if children could not be baptized on condition they *asked for it*, and brought proper sponsors. Tertulian's reply, which was in the *negative*, forms a tract of less than six folio pages, (See Tertulian on baptism,

chapter 18, against Quintillia,) and it is very evident that these children were not mere infants, but *young people*; for Quintillia represents them as *asking* for baptism; and Tertulian in reply recommends that they be classed with widows and other unmarried women, and kept on trial till they give full evidence of piety, before they come to baptism. We hear nothing more of this Pepuzian doctrine, for about half a century. However, it might have been practiced in some few cases among the poor Africans in this sect of gnostics; for in A. D. 253, one Fidus, an ignorant African, inquired of Cyprian, the bishop of Carthage, if children might be baptized before they were eight days old. And this is the *first hint* of infant baptism that can be found in all the records in the universe, whether inspired or uninspired. Cyprian submitted the question of Fidus to a council convened at Carthage, A. D. 253, and that assembly decided that infants might be baptized, not for reasons which pædobaptists now plead, but because an *infant is equal to a man*. Their decree is as follows; "Did not Elisha lay upon a child, and put his mouth upon his mouth, and his eyes upon his eyes, and his hands upon his hands; now the spiritual sense of this is, that infants are equal to men. But if you refuse to baptize them, you destroy this equality, and are partial."—*Cyp. Epist. 66, ad Fidum*.

From this time and circumstance, we admit that infant baptism began to spread in the Roman Catholic churches in Africa, but whether *female bishops* were multiplied to take care of them, history saith not.

To sustain the practice, some have quoted the words of Irenæus, Lib. 2, 22, 4, "Christ came to save all persons by himself, all I say who are *renascuntur in Deum*, (regenerated unto God,) infants and little ones, and children and youths, and elder persons." If Irenæus meant baptism by *renascuntur*, and thus

said that Christ came to save all who *are baptized*, he was too great a heretic to be quoted. But if he meant by it *regeneration*, which is the *fact*, then his words have no reference to baptism.

They have also quoted the words of Justin Martyr; "There were many of both sexes, some sixty, some seventy years old, who were made *disciples* to Christ *ἐκ παιδων* from their childhood. The word he uses is *ἐμαθητεύθησαν*, they were proselyted or made disciples.

——As the phrase *ἐκ παιδων* may relate to children who have come to years of understanding as well as to infants, I am satisfied on a review of the testimony of Justin, that it can not well be urged as conclusive in favor of pedobaptism."—*Wardlaw on bapt.*, p. 112.

"The defenders of infant baptism, attempt to prove it from Justin Martyr and Irenaus; but neither of them say what is attributed to them."—*Starck's hist. of bapt.*, p. 50.

"All the arguments put together, do not prove that *renasci in Deum* means, to be baptized."—*Rossers Library of Christian Fathers*, vol. 1, p. 11.

"The immediate occasion of infant baptism, it cannot be denied, was extravagant ideas of its necessity to salvation."—*Dressler's doctrine of the Sacraments*, p. 137.

"For this cause, the church has received a tradition from the Apostles, even to give baptism unto infants."—*Origen's com. ad Roman*, Lib. 5, fol. 178.

"Origen's words in that age, cannot have much weight, for whatever was regarded as important, was alleged to come from the Apostles."—*Dr. Neander's Ch. hist.*, vol. 1, part 2, p. 367.

"Those Latin works we have, are translated by Rufinus and others with so much liberty, that it is a difficult matter to discern what is Origen's, from what has been foisted in by interpreters."—*Du Pin*, vol 1, p. 108.

This is the kind of testimony that pedobaptists attempt to sustain themselves with, after they have *confessed* that there is no scripture to prove infant baptism. While they esteem the traditions and assertions of Roman Catholics of this age as most fabulous and ridiculous, how can they go back to the darkest ages of Romish superstitions, and credit their falsehoods? Can this end of the *same stick* be rotten basswood, and that end be sound hickory? But it is in proof that infant baptism did not prevail, even in the Romish church, till long after Cyprian's council, for,

It is abundantly evident, that many persons who were born of Christian parents, and educated in the Christian faith, were not baptized until they came to *adult* years, and made a personal profession.

Helena the mother of Constantine, was a very devout and zealous Christian, yet he was not baptized upon her faith. Nor did he dedicate his own children to God in baptism by virtue of his faith : for we are informed by Socrates, that his son Constantius, who succeeded his father in the empire, was baptized by Euzo-
 ius when he was preparing for his expedition against Julianus, and immediately after ended his life at Mop-
 sucrenia twenty-five years after the death of his father.
 —*Eccl. Hist. Lib. 2, chap. 47.*

Basil, the son of Basil, Bishop of Nicene, was baptized in Jordan when far advanced in years.

Gregory the great, the son of Gregory, bishop of Nazianzen, was born while his father was bishop, and yet not baptized until he was twenty, some say thirty, years old. See Osander's book, Cent. iv. L. 3, and Robinson's Hist. p. 250.

Grotius says, that Chrysostom was born of believing parents, and was educated by Melitius, a bishop, yet not baptized till the age of twenty-one.

Erasmus testifies, that Jerom was born in the city of Stridon, of Christian parents, was brought up in

the Christian religion, and was baptized in the thirtieth year of his age.

Vossius affirms, that Nectarius was chosen bishop of Constantinople before he was baptized.

Theodosius, the emperor, was born in Spain; his parents were both Christians, and from his childhood had been trained up in the Nicene faith; was baptized at Thessalonica by Achalio, when he was upwards of thirty years old.—*Vide Junius, Junior*, p. 68. *Rob.* p. 250, *Eccl. Hist. Lib. v. Chap. vi.*

Add to this the fact, that in the 3d, 4th, and 5th centuries, there were large and numberless schools of catechumen, (the children of church members,) who were under a course of instruction preparing for baptism, and that as infant baptism increased, catechetical schools vanished; and the evidence is incontrovertable, that infant baptism was not practiced by the Apostolic churches, or those which immediately succeeded them.

“All the earlier traces of infant baptism are very uncertain. Tertulian is the *first* who mentions it, and he censures it.”—*Von Coln*, vol. 1, p. 469.

“The first traces of infant baptism are found in the Western church, after the middle of the second century.”—*Rhienwald's works*, p. 313.

“In the first two centuries, no documents are found which clearly show the existence of infant baptism at that time.”—*Mathies on bapt.*, p. 187.

Dr. Neander says, “It was only in the course of the third century, that infant baptism was acknowledged as an Apostolic institution.”—*Judd's reply to Stewart*, p. 196.

“Neither in the Scriptures, nor during the first hundred and fifty years, is a sure example of infant baptism to be found, and we must concede that the numerous opposers of it *can not be contradicted on gospel ground.*”—*Prof. Hahn's Theology*, p. 556.

It is thus clear, that all the writers of the first and second centuries, inspired and uninspired, speak of a believer as the only subject, and of *immersion* as the only baptism. In the third century infant baptism was introduced, but only in certain cases; that Jerome, Athanasius, Epiphanius, the Council of Laodicea, of Niocesaria, in the fourth century; Chrysostom, Faustus, Regiensis, and Evegrius in the fifth; Gregory and the Council of Agatha in the sixth; the Bracaren's Council, and that of Toletanus, Paulinus, and his associates in England, in the seventh; Bede, Haime, the Council of Paris, and that of Laodicea, in the eighth; Rabanus and Albinus in the ninth: Smaragdo in the tenth, Anslem, the Waldenses and Albigenes, Peter de Bruis and his numerous associates in the eleventh; Alburtus Magnus, Thomas Aquinas in the twelfth; Jacob Merdingus records that many in Poland, Lombardy, Germany, and Holland in the thirteenth; Carlous, bishop of Meyland, the Thaborites, and many Bohemians in the fourteenth; the Hungarians and Waldenses in their confession of faith, A. D. 1521 and hosts in the 16th century have advocated the Baptists' sentiments and practice.

When thus completely driven off from both Bible and history, the last resort of the pedobaptists is, to plead that infant baptism is a church custom, and as it does no harm, it is well enough to practice it; but we reply, it is not harmless, for,

1. It is a mere act of will worship, which is positively forbidden, Col. ii. 11—23: Isa. i. 12, 13: Matt. xv. 3—9: John xv. 14: 2 John 6.

2. It destroys believers baptism, and should infant baptism universally prevail, believers baptism could no longer exist.

3. However sincerely and devotionally some parents may offer their children in baptism, it is evident, that with the *priests*, the whole fabric of infant baptism is

a mere proselyting scheme. They sprinkle infants, and call them church members, that when they are converted they may the more effectually resist their uniting with any other church. But should I put a pen into the hand of an unconscious babe, and move that hand to sign a legal quitclaim to its temporal interests, would that be an honest conveyance? No more does the priest's or parent's act of sprinkling, destroy the convert's claim to believers baptism.

4. Baptism is said to be, 1 Peter iii. 21, "The answer of a good conscience towards God." But infant baptism destroys all this. 1. The minister knows he is acting without the least divine authority; therefore he can have no good conscience toward God in the act. 2. The infant is totally unconscious. 3. And a great majority of the parents act, one to please the other, or both to please the clergyman, while they are wholly indifferent or totally opposed.

5. The legitimate result of the practice is to make invidious distinctions in the same family, or baptize unbelievers. Suppose a family of ten unconverted children from the age of one to twenty years. The parent is converted and unites with the church. Now if none of these children are baptized and joined to the church, then *the law of the church* is broken; if all are baptized, &c., then *the law of God* is broken; if a part only is to be baptized, who will draw the line of separation. I could relate facts, arising from such dilemmas, too shocking to publish.

6. "It goes to establish the sword of contention in the same house——not long since and not far from where the author lives, (Rochester N. Y.) a respectable member of the church, went to his wife in the congregation, for the purpose of getting his child from her arms to have it baptized; but she had such a mighty conscience upon the subject, that she obstinately

refused to give it up, and her husband had the mortification of a defeat.”—*E. House on bapt.* p. 74.

7. “The adoption of the plan of infant church membership under the gospel, is attended with another difficulty, viz: it naturally leads to the membership of the *wife* upon the faith of her husband, as well as of the children; for in the Jewish church the membership of the former was as fully determined as that of the latter; the husband, if a native Jew, was in the church with his whole family; if a proselyte, he entered with his whole family, *wife, children and servants*. This is too evident to be denied.”—*Chadwick on bapt.*, p. 133.

“Let every parent who has presented his child to God in baptism, bear this in mind, *whether he intended it or not*, he did in *that act*, openly declare the Lord to be his God, and acknowledge himself bound to obey all of God’s commands. Can he after this, refuse to sit down to the Lord’s table?”—*W. T. Hamilton on bapt.*, p. 110.

8. However desirable Christian union is, those who practice infant baptism are the *immediate cause* of existing divisions in the church of God; and while they know that the true church can not fellowship pedobaptism, yet they will not abandon it, that we may unite. Rom. xvi. 17 : 1 Cor. i. 10 : iii. 3 : xi. 18, 19.

9. The Roman Catholics are making fearful inroads; yet pedobaptist opposition is powerless, for when they attempt to prove the falacy of purgatory, prayers for the dead, holy water, image worship, prayers to the saints, infant communion, the sign of the cross, exorcism, salt, spittle, Peter pence, indulgences, auricular confession, &c., the papists uniformly, and *justly* reply, we have as much Bible for each and all of these, as you have for infant baptism; and *our* saints and Fathers whom you quote as *sound* authority,

show that all of the above came from the Apostles, and were in practice as early as pedobaptism.

10. Finally, as there are no directions in the Bible respecting infant baptism, each one makes his own rules. Hence the *schisms* and dissensions among the defenders of it. One says it ought to be administered only to the children of believers; another says it may be given to children when but one of the parents is a professor; a third says, it may be administered on the faith of the grandfather; a fourth says it may be given to any infant, if sponsors will appear for it; a fifth, says that all infants are born holy, therefore they should be baptized irrespective of parents or sponsors. Some say that baptism saves the infant's soul; others deny this. Some say that Roman Catholic baptism is valid, others will rebaptize them. Some say that infants should be baptized, because they are members of the church; others say they should be baptized to make them church members; and these, as every man of reading knows, are but an index to the angry and endless debates, which arise from infant baptism. "*Thus saith the Lord, stand ye in the ways and see; and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls.*"—Jeremiah vi. 16.

While it is thus evident that infant sprinkling is not an institution of heaven, nor a means of grace, and therefore not to be practiced; we would exhort you to *dedicate* your children to God by solemn prayer and Christian instruction, according to the New Testament; and in view of an approaching judgment, and the worth of their souls, we would intreat you to labor early and faithfully for their salvation.

CHAPTER V.

THE ACTION OF BAPTISM.

SECTION I.

Prepositions.

MR. SAWYER says that *εἰς ἀπο ἐκ ἐν* have power to change βαπτω into χέω λουω ραντίζω; his argument in plain English is this; the prepositions out, from, in, into, have power to change the verb dip, into dip, pour, wash, or sprinkle. To prove that βαπτω *εἰς* (*dip into*;) means dip into, he quotes from the Septuagint Lev. iv. 6: ix. 9: xiv. 6: and he might have added from the New Testament, Matt. xxviii. 19: Mark i. 9: Acts viii. 16—38: Acts xix. 3—5: 1Cor. xii. 13.

Mr. S. says, page 3—17, "that *ἀπο* does not mean *in* and *out of*, but *from* and *with*. Hence when this preposition follows the verb βαπτίζω it shows that the liquid employed, is used in some other way than by dipping." To prove that *ἀπο* does not mean *out of*, he quotes Matt. iii. 16. "Jesus when he was baptized went up straightway *ἀπο* (*out of*) the water." Mark i. 10; "Jesus was baptized of John in Jordan, and straightway coming up *ἀπο* *out of* the water." But if these passages prove any thing, they prove Mr. Sawyer sadly mistaken. To show that *ἀπο* does not mean *in*, and that it even has power to change βαπτω, *dip*, into sprinkle, he quotes four texts from the Septuagint, in which he says the word βαπτω is followed by *ἀπο*. Ex. xii. 22, "And ye shall take a bunch of hyssop *καὶ βαψαντες ἀπο τοῦ αἵματος*, and *dip it in* the blood." Lev. iv. 17, "*καὶ βαψει ὁ ἱερεὺς τὸν δακτύλον ἀπο τοῦ αἵματος*, and the priest shall *dip* his finger *in* [some] of the blood." Lev. xiv. 16, "*καὶ βαψει τὸν δακτύλον τὸν δεξιὸν ἀπο ὕδατος*, and the priest shall *dip* his right finger *in* the oil." Deut. xxxiii. 24, "*βαψει ἐν ἐλαίῳ τὸν πόδα αὐτοῦ*

dip his foot *in* oil." It is obvious that βαπτίζω is not followed by *apo* in Deut. xxxiii. 24, but by *en*; hence this text is not only misrepresented, but misquoted, and in the other three, the inviolate meaning of βαπτίζω *dip*, is preserved, and *apo* rendered *in*: and it is a singular fact, that at Lev. xiv. 15, 16, the three words pour, dip and sprinkle occur in-succession, to describe three distinct acts of the same service; thus showing their contradistinction in Hebrew and Greek, as well as in English. We presume Mr. Sawyer made the best selection he could, yet so far from disproving immersion, he has altogether sustained it; for the six texts quoted by him read, "dip in, dip in, dip in, dip in, went up out of the water, coming up out of the water."

Mr. Sawyer has made equally wretched work with *en* and *ex*. (See his CRITICAL DISSERTATION, p. 14—17.) He assures us that *en* means *at* or *with*; hence baptizing *en* ιορδανην and *en* υδατι means baptizing *with Jordan*, and baptizing *at water*. But as he admits, p. 3, that the meaning of βαπτίζω is to *dip*, it must be obvious to every reader, that dipping with Jordan, and dipping at water, is as foreign from scripture language, as it is from common sense. To reply in particular to each of Mr. Sawyer's errors, would swell this volume beyond its design; therefore we say, the English language has about fifty prepositions, to each of which have been given from five to thirty different meanings, and the law of languages allows the use of one preposition for another. Thus, "I lodge at the City Hotel. That is, I lodge *in*, not in the street by the side of the Hotel." The Greeks have but eighteen prepositions. It is therefore more necessary that one should often be changed for another, and that each should be used in several varieties. Still, every preposition has its appropriate use. The primary meaning of *ex* is *out of*; but it has five other meanings; *ex*

is *in*, but it has eleven other meanings; *εις* means *into*, yet it has eleven others. Still, all grammarians say that each preposition has but one primary meaning, into which all the other significations arising from figurative or analogical relations may be resolved.

But as Mr. Sawyer prefers deciding the meaning of words by the inspired text, (see p. 2,) we will examine a few chapters of the Septuagint, where baptism is not the subject matter of discourse. Genesis i. 1: *εν αρχη* "in, not near to the beginning;" verse 11, "Whose seed is *εν αυτω*, in, not at or near by;" verse 12, "Whose seed was *εν αυτω*, in, not at itself;" verse 14, "And God said, Let there be lights *εν τω στερωματι*, in, not at the firmament. It is true that our translators have rendered *εν* *with*, at Matt. iii. 11: Mark i. 8: and a few other places; and it is equally true, that in doing so they have taken the twelfth meaning instead of its primary. Gen. vii. 1: Come thou and all thy house *εις την κιβωτον*, into, not on or by the ark. Psal. ix. 17: The wicked shall be turned *εις*, into, not at or near by hell. Prov. iii. 4: Who hath ascended up *εις*, into, not on or by heaven. Dan. vi. 16: Daniel was cast *εις*, into, not towards the lion's den. Jonah i. 12: Jonah was cast *εις*, into, not near to the sea. Matt. v. 13: And the herd ran violently down a steep place *εις την θαλασσαν*, and were choked in, not at or by the sea, on dry ground. Matt. xxv. 46: These shall go away *εις*, into, not upon everlasting punishment, and the righteous *εις*, into, not towards life eternal. Mark i. 9: Jesus was baptized of John *εις*, into, not by or towards Jordan. Acts viii. 39: Philip and the eunuch came up *εξ του υδατος*, out of the water. But enough has been said, to show that Mr. Sawyer's views of Greek prepositions would ruin the Bible.

SECTION II.

Mosaic Baptisms.

2 Kings v. 10 : Elisha said unto Naaman, **Go and רחצ**, λουσαι, *bathe* in Jordan seven times. The word here used in Hebrew and Greek is one which definitely means to wash the whole body, in distinction from those words used to denote washing of clothes or parts of the body, as hands, face, or feet. Verse 14 : Then went he down and טבל, *dipped* himself seven times in Jordan, according to the saying of the man of God. Parallel cases of washing by dipping constantly occur in the Old Testament, and frequently in the New. Acts xxii. 16 : Arise and βαπτισαι και απολουσαι, *be immersed*, and wash away thy sins. Rom. vi. 4 : Therefore we συνεταφημεν, *are buried with him by baptism*. The plural pronouns, we and us, evidently include Paul with others baptized. So Paul declares that he was immersed. Had Naaman and Paul understood רחצ and λουσαι as Mr. Sawyer does, (p. 5,) "the joint action of pouring and affusion," they would not have been טבל, συμβαπτω, *immersed, buried in water*.

The Jews so far from understanding טבל and βαπτισαι to mean pouring or sprinkling, even understood רחצ, *bathe*, and λουω, *wash*, to mean *immerse*, as is evident from their best ancient authors, and the concessions of able pedobaptists.

"Every person baptized or dipped, whether he were washed from pollution, or baptized unto proselytism, must dip his whole body at one dipping; and wheresoever in the law *washing* of the body or garments is mentioned, it means nothing else."—*Maimonides Mikvaot*, chapt. 3.

"Although the baptism practiced by John and the apostles did not in all circumstances resemble these

Jewish washings to which I have now adverted, yet it was precisely like them in that main particular of *immersion* in water."—*J. J. Gurney on the pecul. of Friends*, p. 61.

"Whenever, in the law of washing, the flesh or clothes is mentioned, it means nothing else than the dipping of the whole body in the bath; for if any one dips himself all over except the tip of his little finger, he is still in his uncleanness."—*Maimonides Hilch. Mikva*, chapt. 1, sect. 2.

"Dipping, among the Jews, was a national custom."—*Lightfoot's Works*, vol. 1, p. 585.

Mr. Sawyer next quotes Judith xii. 7: "She abode in the camp three days, and went out in the night into the valley of Bethulia, and βάπτιστο (*dipped*) ἐν τῇ παρεμβολῇ ἐπὶ τῆς πηγῆς τοῦ ὕδατος, washed herself in a fountain of water by the camp;" and remarks, that "βαπτίζω, *baptize*, expresses ceremonial cleansing, by some mode differing from immersion."

Maimonides, the great Jewish author, who ought to know as much concerning the language and customs of the Jews as Mr. Sawyer does, says: "A menstruous woman, as also all other unclean persons, were washed in some confluence of waters, in which so much water ought to be as may serve to wash the whole body at one *dipping*. Our wise men have esteemed this to be a cubit square, and three cubits deep, and this measure contains 40 seahs (80 gallons) of water."—*Lightfoot's Works*, vol. 2, p. 119.

"In the days of R. Joshua Ben Levi, some endeavored to abolish this *dipping*, for the sake of the *women* of Galilee, because by reason of the cold, &c. R. Joshua Ben Levi said unto them, Do you go about to take away that which hedges in Israel from transgression?"—*Hieros Beracoth*, fol. 6, 3.

"The baptism of John was by *plunging* the body after the same manner of the *washing* of unclean per-

sons, and the baptism of proselytes."—*Lightfoot's Works*, vol. 2, p. 121.

That Judith washed, is probable; but it is not contained in the text. Does it follow, because baptism is performed for the purpose of *washing*, that baptism and washing are the same thing? Mr. Sawyer might just as well give *cool* as the rendering of βαπτίζω, because hot iron is βαπτίζω, (dipped,) to cool it. Judith's washing or cleansing was but an effect of immersing herself; and it is a notorious fact, that fountains in that hot climate were uniformly provided with conveniences for bathing; and if she simply wished to sprinkle her feet, or wash her hands, why did she go under the cover of night?

Ecclesiasticus xxxiv. 25: "He that βαπτίζομενος ὁμοῦ νεκροῦ washeth himself after the touching of a dead body, if he toucheth it again, what availeth his washing?" Mr. Sawyer says, p. 7, "The mode of cleansing designated is that prescribed by Moses, Numb. xix. 19, and consists of sprinkling and washing, but not immersion or dipping." But that this ceremonial *bathing* was total immersion, is evident from the fact that it is denoted by טבל *dip* or immerse, in the Hebrew.

"The baptisms with the Jews were not by sprinkling. The Hebrew טבל *dip* cannot possibly signify sprinkle; baptism is never in the New Testament compared with Levitical sprinklings, but with the death and resurrection of Christ."—*Starck's Hist. of Bapt.* p. 8.

That sprinkling is named at Numb. xix. 19, is true; and so is *bathing*. These were two distinct actions, and both were enjoined: first sprinkle with the water of purification; and then immerse in water. We do not contend that the Levitical sprinklings were immersions; but that their *bathings* were, is evident, not only from this text; but also from Levit. xv. 5, 8, 11, 13, 21, 22, 27: xvi. 26—28: xvii. 15, 16: Numb. xix.

V, 8, 19: Levit. xiv. 9: xvi. 4, 24: xxii. 6: Deut. xxiii. 11: 2 Chron. iv. 6.

"Unclean persons were *immersed*, and purified by sprinkling."—*Theodore* com. on Heb. ix. 10.

"In proselyte baptism, the male after circumcision is led into the water, and completely immerses himself"—*Schneckenburger*, *Pros. Bapt.* p. 141.

"As in the Jewish custom the persons stood in the water, and having been instructed, and entered into a covenant to renounce all idolatry and take the God of Israel for their God, then *plunge* themselves under the water; it is probable that the rite was thus performed at Enon." *Dr. A. Clark's comment on John* iii. 23.

Mr. Sawyer next quotes Mark vii. 3, 4: "For the Pharisees and all the Jews, except they *νιψονται*, (*wash their hands*,) oft, eat not, holding the traditions of the elders; and (when they came) from the market, except they *βαπτισονται*, (*immerse themselves*,) they eat not; and many other things there be, which they have received to hold, as the *βαπτισμους* (*immersing*) of cups and pots, brazen vessels and of *κλινων*, (beds.) Mr. Sawyer says, p. 10, that these persons and things were not immersed, but sprinkled, and assigns as a reason, "the unreasonableness of baptizing beds." But on this principle he could as well decide that, Gen. vii. 15, "two of all flesh wherein is breath of life" did not go into the ark; and, Col. ii. 9, the fullness of the Godhead bodily did not dwell in Jesus Christ. The fact that *βαπτισονται* (*they immerse*) is used in the 4th verse to distinguish the action from *νιψονται*, (*they wash hands*,) in the 3d verse, fully proves that, they did immerse themselves.

Again, this washing of hands was done by *all the Jews*, young and old, male and female, at each time of eating; while the immersion (verse 4) was only performed by the *individual* who had been at the market,

which probably did not occur more than once a week ; and in addition to etymology and circumstances, we have the testimony of the most able Jewish writers, who were eye witnesses to the Jewish ceremonies. "If the Pharisees touched but the garments of the common people, they were defiled all one as if they had touched a profluvius person, and needed *immersion*."—*Misna Chagi, chap. 2, sec. 7.*

"In a laver which holds forty seahs of water, every defiled man *dips* himself, except a profluvius man ; and in it they *dip* all unclean vessels."—*Maimonides Hilch. Mikvaot, chap. 9, sec. 5.*

"Mark vii. 4 : They bathed their whole persons."—*Vatablus Prof. of Hebrew in Paris.*

"John ii. 6 : There were set there six water pots, &c. They were placed there, some of them for the cleansing of cups and tables, and others for such purifications as required the *immersion* of the whole body."—*Dr. Macknight's Harmony, sec. 19.*

That the cups, pots, &c. were immersed, is evident. "He that buys a vessel for the use of a feast, of a gentile, whether a molten or glass vessel, מִטְבֵּילָן *they dip them* in the waters of the laver, and after that they may eat and drink in them ; and such as they use for cold things, as cups and pots and jugs, they wash them, וּמִטְבִּילֵן *and dip them* and they are free for use ; and such as they use for hot things, as cauldrons and kettles, (brazen vessels,) they heat them with hot water, and scour them, וּמִטְבִּילֵן *and immerse them*."—*Maimonides Hilch. Abot, Hatumaot, chap. 12, sec. 6*

Jewish beds were very different things from our beds. They were such as a man just recovered from the palsy could take under his arm and carry home with him. Matt. ix. 2—6 : Mark ii. 9 : John v. 11, 12 ; and that they were immersed there can be no doubt. Jewish writers, who ought to understand their own laws and language as well as Mr. Sawyer, say,

"A bed that is wholly defiled, if **הטבילה** *he dips* it part by part, it is pure."—*Misna celim, chap. 18, sec. 5,*

"**הטביל בו את המטה** if *he dips the bed* in it, (the pool of water,) although its feet are plunged into the thick clay, (at the bottom of the pool,) it is clean.

הכר והכסת a pillow or bolster of skin, when a man lifts up the ends or mouth of them out of the water, the water which is within them will be drawn; what shall he do? **מטבילו** *he must dip* them, and lift them up by their fringe."—*Misna Mikvaot, chap. 7, sec. 7.*

The original law for immersing all these things is at Levit. xi. 32: xiv. 6—8: Numb. xxxi. 23, 24; but to this law many traditions were added.

The above immersions of persons, vessels and beds, fully explain Heb. ix. 10: *διαφοροῖς βαπτισμοῖς, divers washings*; which were not different actions, as pouring, sprinkling, and immersing, but immersions on divers subjects and different occasions. That *βαπτισμοῖς*, verse 10, does not mean or include sprinkling, but stands opposed to it, and means immersion, is evident from the fact that Paul drops *βαπτισμα, immerse*, and und uses *σαντιζω, sprinkle*, verses 13, 19, 21, of the same chapter.

"Divers *immersions* and ordinances concerning the flesh."—*Macknight's Translation.*

"Jewish baptism is a solemn rite, instituted by God, in which proselytes of both sexes, in the presence of three credible witnesses, are dipped in water."—*Reiskius.*

The Talmud Tract, Repudii, speaking of Jethro, Moses' father-in-law, says, "he was made a proselyte by circumcision and *immersion* in water."

Mr. Sawyer's effort, p. 12, to identify **הרחץ** *dip*, **והטביל** *wash*, and **נזה** *sprinkle*, is as unsuccessful as his attempt, p. 13, to find *σαντιζω* in the Septuagint, at Ex. xxix. 4: Levit. viii. 6: xiv. 4—9; Numb. viii. 6: xix. 17—19.

SECTION III.

Waters of Palestine.

MR. SAWYER says, p. 11, "During a large part of the year, and in many parts of the country, water is extremely scarce," so that immersion could not be performed. Deut. viii. 7: "For the Lord thy God bringeth thee into a good land, a land of brooks of water, of fountains and depths, that spring out of the valleys and hills." Palestine is about 200 miles long and 80 wide; bounded on the west by the Mediterranean sea. The springs of Jordan lie west of the city of Dan, in the north of Palestine. The lake Phila is 12 miles south of Dan; 15 miles further south is lake Samechon, 7 miles long and 4 wide: 28 miles further south is the sea of Galilee, 13 miles long and 5 wide; and still further south is the Dead Sea, 76 miles long and 18 wide, (Josephus' War, Book 4, chap. 8, sec. 4,) or 24 miles long and 7 wide, (Brown's Bible Dictionary.)

The RIVERS of Palestine are the *Jordan*, 160 miles long, 30 yards wide, and so deep that a miracle was wrought to let the Jews cross it; Joshua iii. 14—16: 2 Kings ii. 14; the river *Kishon* Judges iv. 7—13; the river *Aaron*, Deut. iii. 16; the river *Gad*, 2 Sam. xxiv. 5; the river *Jabock*, Joshua xii. 2. The BROOKS *Cherith*, 1 Kings, xvii. 3; *Eschol*, Numb. xiii. 23, 24; *Jeruel*, 2 Chron. xx. 16: *Besor*, 1 Sam. xxx. 10; *Kidron*, 2 Sam. xv. 23: John xviii. 1; *Gaash*, 2 Sam. xxiii. 30; *Kishon*, 1 Kings xviii. 40. "And in a country so abounding with hills as Canaan, it is probable that valleys and brooks were seldom separate." (Brown's Bible Dictionary.) There were also many POOLS, as the Pool of Samaria, 1 Kings xxii. 38; the Upper Pool, 2 Kings xviii. 17: the King's Pool, Neh. ii. 14; the Lower Pool, Isa. xxii. 9; the Old Pool, Isa. xxii. 11; the Pool of Bethesda,

John v. 2, which Maundrell says is 120 paces long and 40 wide ; and the Pool of Siloam, John ix. 7—11, nearly the size of Bethesda. “ Besides all these public conveniences for immersion, there were many *mik-waath* or collections of water in the form of bathing-houses, for the purification of unclean persons and vessels, required by the law of Moses, (See Levit. xv. 16: Numb. xix. 7, 8,) which was always by immersion.”—*J. S. C. F. Frey, a Jewish Rabbi, Essay on Bapt. p. 109.*

“ The Spring (Siloë) issues from a rock, and the pool, or rather two pools of the same name, (Siloam) are quite close to the spring ; here you find a village called Siloam. At the foot of this village is another fountain, denominated in Scripture, Rogel ; opposite to this is a third which receives its name from the blessed Virgin——we have nothing left of the primitive architecture of the Jews at Jerusalem, except the pool of Bethesda. This is still to be seen near St. Stephen’s Gate, and *it bounded the Temple on the north.*”—*Chateaubriand’s travels, p. 311, 312—353.*

Dr. Gill has conclusively proved that there were twelve large reservoirs for immersing, within the Temple. These, together with the pool of Bethesda, adjoining the Temple, and other waters above named, not only served for the baptizing of converts on the day of Pentecost, A. D. 33, but were absolutely necessary for the multitude of Jews assembled (Acts ii. 5—11) to bathe in, according to the law of Moses ; (Lev. xvi. 4: xvii. 14—16: xxii. 6: Deut. xxiii. 11;) which bathings Mr. Sawyer assures us, p. 1, “ were of *daily* occurrence among the Jews, in every period of their national existence.” Hence he who pleads that Jerusalem and the surrounding country was so destitute of water that immersion could not be performed, must be ignorant of Bible and geography ; for both represent

Palestine bountifully furnished with conveniences for immersion, and it is certain that the Apostles and John used them; for we find them baptizing *in Jordan*, and at Eanon, because there was *ἰδρυα πολλὰ*, *much water* there. And we have no evidence that the water was brought to the candidate in a *bowl or basin*; but the candidate went to, and *into* the water, as the Baptists do now. Matt. iii. 16: John iii. 23: Mark i. 10: Acts viii. 36—39.

SECTION IV.

Of Sprinkling and its Origin.

THE word *Παριζω* from *Παρω*, is translated *sprinkle*. Therefore if this were the action of baptism, we should have it in plain English, Matt. xxviii. 19, "Go teach all nations, *sprinkling* them, &c;" but the word *sprinkle*, is in no instance connected with baptizing, nor is the sprinkling of water without putting ashes, blood, or some other substance in it, found in the Bible. *Blood*, Lev. vii. 2: xiv. 7—51: xvi. 14: Heb. ix. 13—19: xi. 28: xii. 24: 1 Peter i. 2. *Ashes*, Ex. ix. 8—10: *Ashes and water mixed*, Num. xix. 13—18, 19, 20, 21. *Oil*, Lev. xiv. 16—27. *Dust*, Job ii. 12. *Not named*, Isa. lii. 15: Heb. x. 22. *Water*, (Spirit of God,) Ez. xxxvi. 25. The Spirit and its graces are represented by water at Isa. lv. 1: John iv. 14: vii. 37, 39: Rev. xxii. 17. The first appearance of pouring for baptism, was in the eighth century, when baptism was considered necessary to salvation by all the Roman Catholics. As there were frequent cases of unbaptized clinics, (sick persons,) who were much distressed, lest dying unbaptized they should be lost, the monks invented pouring water on them.

A. D. 753, Pope Stephen III. was driven from Rome

by Astulphus, king of the Lombards, and put himself under the protection of Pepin, king of France. During Stephen's residence in the monastery of St. Dennis, some monks of Cressy, in Brittany, proposed to him 19 questions, one of which was, "If pouring water on the head of the sick and dying would be baptism?" To which he replied, that "In such cases of necessity, pouring should be baptism." From this decision arose the private baptism of the sick by pouring; but immersion, trine or single, was still universally administered to the healthy. But it soon became a question what degree of sickness should prevent immersion; and as many infants died soon after they were born, and some even before, the doctrine of baptismal salvation drove the priests and monks among the midwives, and introduced indecencies which I forbear to mention. The want of water at hand, and the want of suitable tubs to dip in, together with other circumstances not necessary to name, led the priests to plead for pouring instead of dipping; but this doctrine of *Rantizing* was so repugnant to the feelings of the Catholics themselves, that they never obtained a public act in favor of it, till A. D. 1311, when the council of Ravenna, (in Italy,) by the Pope's authority, declared dipping or sprinkling, indifferent. While the Catholics had the control of England, they uniformly immersed; and the Episcopal Rubric which was established by law in Elizabeth's reign, reads, "Then the priest shall take the child into his hands and shall say unto the Godfather and Godmother, name this child. And naming it after them, if they certify that the child may well endure it, he shall dip it in the water, discreetly and warily, saying, N., I baptise thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, amen. But if they certify that the child is weak, it shall suffice to pour water upon it.—*British Rubric, under baptism.*

During the bloody persecution of Mary, Queen of England, A. D. 1554—8, many English and Scotch Protestants fled to Germany for refuge, and there formed a society. In A. D. 1556, Calvin published a book for the benefit of these Protestants, entitled, "The form of prayers, and administration of the Sacraments, approved by the famous and Godly learned man, John Calvin." The form of baptism prescribed by this was, "The priest shall take the water in his hand and lay it on the child's forehead, saying, I baptize thee, &c."

John Knox with other refugees, returned to Scotland, A. D. 1559, and brought with them Calvin's book and new doctrine of sprinkling, and it was established by law with the rest of their creed, A. D. 1560; and from Scotland it spread into England and America. But still the law of the church of England enjoined dipping, and in the Presbyterian assembly of 49 Divines, convened at Westminster, (near London,) A. D. 1643, the subject was keenly debated for several days, and finally decided by a vote of twenty-five for sprinkling, and twenty-four for immersion. And even this small majority was obtained at the earnest request of Dr. Lightfoot, who had acquired great influence in that assembly."—*Dr. Brewster's Ed. En. Art. Bapt.*

"The custom of sprinkling children instead of dipping them in the fount, which at first was allowed only in case of weakness or sickness of the infant, has so far prevailed, that immersion is at length quite excluded. What principally tended to confirm the practice of effusion or sprinkling, was that several of our Protestant Divines, flying into Germany and Switzerland during the bloody reign of Queen Mary, and returning home when Elizabeth came to the crown, brought back with them a great zeal for the Protestant churches beyond the sea, where they had been received and sheltered; and having observed that at Geneva and some

other places, baptism was administered by sprinkling, they thought they could not do the church of England a greater piece of service, than to introduce a practice dictated by so great an oracle as Calvin. This, together with the coldness of our northern climate, was what contributed to banish entirely the practice of dipping infants in the fount.—*Enc. Perth. Vol. 3, p. 256.*

“The practice of aspersion or sprinkling, was bro’t into the church by the *Popish school men*; and our dissenters have it from them. The schoolmen employed their thoughts how to find out a reason for the alteration to sprinkling; and brought it into use in the twelfth century.” —*John Floyer, Essay on bapt. p. 58.*

All the Nations of Christians that do now, or formerly did submit to the Bishops of Rome, do sprinkle; and though the English received not this custom till *after* the decay of Popery, yet they have *since* received it from such neighboring nations as had began it in the time of the Pope’s power. But all other Christians in the world, who never owned the Pope’s usurped power, do, and ever *dip*.”—*Dr. Wall, hist. of infant bapt. part 2, p. 477.*

SECTION V.

Versions of the Bible.

THE old Syriac or Peshito, was translated from the original in the beginning of the second century, and in the very country where the Apostles lived, and by persons who understood both languages, and within a few years past, it has been reprinted by the British and foreign Bible Society, and is used by all Christians in Syria and the East. In this version, βαπτίζω is rendered *amad*, *immerse*. The Ethiopic or Aby-

ian in the Gheez, was translated from the original, about the middle of the fourth century. In this version βαπτίζω is translated by ተጠጥ Tamak, *immerse*. The Amharic in the common dialect of Ethiopia, was translated by Mr. Abraham, a learned Ethiopian, and was published by the British and Foreign Bible Society, A. D. 1822, in which βαπτίζω is rendered ተጠጥ Tamak, *immerse*. The ancient Armenian version was made by Miesrob, and the patriarch Isac, in the beginning of the fifth century, in which βαπτίζω is rendered *mugurdel, immerse*. See Mekitar Vartabed Dictionary of the Armenian Language, Venice, A. D. 1749, and Horne's Introduction, Vol. 2, p. 208.

The modern Armenian version, printed and circulated by the Russian, and British and Foreign Bible Societies, translate βαπτίζω, *mugurdel, immerse*. The Georgian version, made in the eighth century by Euphemius, renders βαπτίζω, *nathlistemad, immerse*.—*Robinson's hist. of Bapt.* p. 7.

The Coptic, made in the fifth century, and used in Lower Egypt, renders βαπτίζω, ٲⲓⲙⲥ, *tomas, immerse*.—See Louis Picques, in *Le Long Biblioth, Sac. Pars* 1, p. 287, and the annual report of the English Baptist Mission Society, for A. D. 1834, p. 32.

The several Arabic versions of the New Testament which were made between the seventh and eleventh centuries, render βαπτίζω, ٲٲⲓⲙⲥ *amad* صبغ *tzabag* or جنس *gatas, dip, plunge, immerse*. The Persian four gospels, were translated by J. J. Al Tabrizi, A. D. 1341, and the whole New Testament, by Meer Seyd Ali, A. D. 1812, and published at Petersburg, London and Calcutta. This version renders βαπτίζω شستگاه *Shustgah, غسل ghushl*, and the derivative of ٲٲⲓⲙⲥ *amad*, ablution, immerse. The Turkish version of the New Testament, written by Albertus Boboosky, and published by the British and Foreign Bible Society, A. D. 1819, renders βαπτίζω ٲٲⲓⲙⲥ *am-*

ad, immerse. The Orenberg Tartar, published by the Russian Bible Society, renders βαπτίζω, אָמַד *am-ad*, immerse. The first Hebrew version of the New Testament, translated by Elias Hutter, A. D. 1599, renders βαπτίζω, טָבַל *taval*, immerse. The old Latin Italic version, adopted the word βαπτίζω without translating it; but that they understood it *immerse*, is evident from the fact that the MSS. Codex Vercellensis, and Codex Veronensis, uniformly construct βαπτίζω with the accusative case. Thus, Matt. iii. 6, Cod. Vercel, "et baptizaban——ab illo in Jordanen." Cod. Veron, "et baptizabantur——danen," and were baptized by him into the Jordan. Verse 11, Cod. Veron., "baptizo Vos in aquam," I baptize you into water. Verse 13, Cod. Veron., "Tunc Venit Jesus a Galilaea ad Johannem ut baptizaretur ab eo in Jordanen." Then came Jesus from Galilee to John, that he might be baptized by him into the Jordan."—See Evangeliarum Quadruplex ed J. Blanchini, Rome A. D. 1749.

Jaspis, an eminent German scholar, renders βαπτίζω by *immergo*, *immerse*, or *tingo*, to dip. The Gothic, was translated from the Greek by Uphilas in the fourth century. Of this version, we have only the four gospels, and a part of the Epistle to the Romans. But in these, he renders βαπτίζω, *daupyan*, to dip. He renders Mark vii. 4, on which there has been some dispute, "ni daupyand," unless they *dip*; and many other things there be, which they have received to hold, as "daupeinins," *the dippings* of cups, and pots, and brazen vessels, and couches. The German translation, from the Latin Vulgate, printed in 1466, and Luther's translation which was published in several parts or numbers, between 1522 and 1532, and the translation of Caspar Ulenburg in 1630, all render βαπτίζω, *taufen*, *dip*. Gesenius classes *taufen*, with the Gothic *doufan*, (*daupyan*), the Ital. *tuffare* and

other words signifying to *dip*, and says it is identical in form with the Heb. taval, to *dip*, to *immerse*.

M. Luther says, "the Germans call baptism, *tauff*, from depth, which in their language they call *tieff*, as it is proper that those who are baptized should be deeply immersed." The German Swiss or Helvetic version, made by John Piscator; in 1604, and the translation made by Jo. Henry Reizius, in 1703, both render βαπτίζω *taufen*, and explain it in the margin by *eintauchen*, and use the same word at Mark vii. 4: Luke xi. 38: Heb. vi. 2: ix. 10: thus making it certain that these texts teach dipping. The Jewish German translation, published at London a few years since, renders βαπτίζω *taufen, dip*. The Belgian or Flemish translation made from the Latin Vulgate in 1475, republished by the Synod of Dort in 1637, renders βαπτίζω *doopen, dip*. The Danish version, made from the Latin vulgate, as well as that which was translated from Luther's version, by order of Christian III. king of Denmark, in 1550, and the version made by order of Christian IV. king of Denmark, from the original Greek, in 1607, all render βαπτίζω *dobe, dip*. The Swedish Bible was made from Luther's version, at Upsal, in 1541, and was afterwards revised and made to conform with the original, by order of Charles XII. king of Sweden, in 1703. This version renders βαπτίζω *dopa, dip*. The Welsh translation of the New Testament was first made by order of Parliament, in 1567. During the reign of James I. it was corrected and republished by Dr. Parry, in 1620. In this version βαπτίζω is rendered *bedyddio, immerse*. Edward Lhuyd, a learned Welshman, says, "Bedydd, the Welsh word for baptism, is derived from suddiant, a British word, which is well known to signify *dipping*, or *immersion*, and the verb of which is *suddo*."—(See article Baptisma, in Lhuyd's Arch. Brit. comp. vocab. Ed. in 1707.

The Sclavonian, or Old Russian translation of the New Testament, was made by Cyril and Methodius, in 1570. The Russian being a branch of the Greek church, uniformly practiced immersion, but they added the sign of the cross, which they considered the essential part of baptism; therefore they translated βαπτίζω *krestit, to cross*. Thus, Matt. iii. 5, 6: "There went out unto him Jerusalem, and all the region round about Jordan, and were *crossed* by him in Jordan." The New Testament made by order of emperor Alexander, in 1816, which was finished at Moscow in 1822, retains *krestit*, yet every reader knows that the Russian church uniformly *dips*.

The Romanese language is divided into two dialects. The *Churwelsche* is spoken by those of Engadine, a valley of Switzerland; and the *Ladiniche* by those who live on the confines of Italy. In each of these versions they have adopted the word βαπτίζω without translating it.

Of the English versions we can only say, Wickliffe's was made in 1380, Tindal's in 1526, Coverdale's in 1535, Mathew's in 1537, Cranmer's in 1539, Tonstal's in 1541, Geneva in 1560, Bishops' in 1568. All these versions followed the Latin vulgate in adopting βαπτίζω, only changing the Greek ω omega for the Roman e. Queen Elizabeth was immersed in infancy; still, she ordered all Baptists to leave the kingdom, and allowed two of them to be burnt at Smithfield, July 22d, 1575. About this time the English bishops began to practice sprinkling, having borrowed it of the Scotch; and in the time of this rage for Baptist blood and Calvin's sprinkling, our version of the Bible was made. King James I. succeeded Elizabeth in 1603, and although immersion was still established by law, yet sprinkling in practice was constantly gaining the ascendancy. A. D. 1610, James made our version; and April 11th, 1612, he burned at Litchfield Mr. Edward Wightman

of Burton upon Trent, for being a Baptist. Such was the spirit of the monarch who ordered the forty-seven translators to "conform as nearly as possible to the Bishops' Bible, and to adopt and not translate the old ecclesiastical words," such as βλασφημεω, blaspheme; αμην, amen; αγγελος, angel; ζηλος, zealous; Βιβλος, Bible; Γενεσις, Genesis; εκκλησια, congregation; τιτλος, title; κορβαν, corban; φιλοσοφια, philosophy; χαρακτηρ, character; ψαλμος psalms; α and ω, alpha and omega; συναγωγη, synagogue; Σαββατον, Sabbath; μαρτυρ, martyr; καθολικος, catholic; αναθεματιζω, anathematize; βαπτιζω, baptize. To some of these words we have given appropriate significations in English; while blaspheme, corban, alpha and omega, synagogue, church, anathematize, and especially baptize, are constantly perplexing the unlearned.

Persons who have not thought extensively on the subject, look upon our version as the only Bible; or, if they know there are other translations, they suppose them all the same. But each Christian nation has the Bible in its own language. Some are translations from the originals; others are translations from translations. Some have translated all the original words; others have not. In all entire translations, βαπτιζω is rendered *dip*, or an equivalent. In our Bible, unfortunately, the word βαπτιζω, is not translated; and pedobaptists have seized this circumstance to puzzle the ignorant and sustain their sprinkling. But suppose neither of Peters words were translated at Acts ii. 38. μετανοησατε, Repent, και, and βαπτισθητω, be baptized, and thousands of *designing* men should rack their brains for criticisms to prove that μετανοεω, *repent*, neither means to *turn away from sin*, nor *be sorry for it*; what would be the result? They might dupe the ignorant; but would the world be improved by their labors?

Pedobaptists treat βαπτω and its cognates precisely

as the Universalists do *αιων*, eternal; and the latter can as easily prove future punishment limited, as the former that *βαπτίζω*, baptize, means to sprinkle; and when pedobaptists encounter Universalists, they are obliged to adopt correct principles of interpretation, or be defeated.

SECTION VI.

Direct Arguments for Immersion.

THE Greeks have several words which they employ with reference to the use of water. *Ραντίζω*, from *ραίνω*, to sprinkle; *χέω*, and *εκχέω*, pour, to-pour out; *αγνίζω*, to purify; *καθαρίζω*, to cleanse; *νίπτω*, to wash the hands, *face* or feet; *λουω*, to bathe the body; *πλυνω*, to wash clothes; and *βαπτίζω*, from *βαπτω*, to dip or immerse. In the English Bible, the word *sprinkle* occurs sixty-two times. In 31 instances it is a translation from *ραίνω*; in 23 instances from the compounds of *χέω*; in 8 instances from other words; but in no instance is it from *βαπτω* or *βαπτίζω*. To pour, with its derivatives, occurs 152 times. In 94 instances it is translated from *χέω* and its compounds; and 58 times from other words and phrases, amounting to 27 varieties; but in no instance from *βαπτω* or *βαπτίζω*. To wash occurs 139 times; 38 times it is a translation of *νίπτω*; 49 times *λουω*; 44 times *ραίνω*; 3 times *χέω*; and 5 times *βαπτω* or *βαπτίζω*, as the effect of immersion—as at Mark vii. 4.

To dip, with its derivatives, occurs 22 times. Once it is from *μολυνω*, *stain*, as when Joseph's coat was dipped in blood—Gen. xxxvii. 31; the other 21 times it is from *βαπτω* or *βαπτίζω*; but never from *ραίνω*, *χέω*, *νίπτω*, *λουω*, *πλυνω*, or any of their compounds or derivatives. To plunge occurs but once, and there it is *βαπτω*. The Hebrew word *טבל* occurs in the Old Tes-

tament 17 times. In the Septuagint it is 16 times rendered βαπτω or βαπτίζω, and once μολυνω, *to dye*. Junius and Tremmelius translate it into Latin 16 times by *tingo, immergo, and demergo*; and our English version translates it 16 times *to dip or plunge*, and once *died*.

Thus we find that in Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and English, the definite and immutable meaning of the word is *to dip, to immerse, to plunge*.

Now if to baptize is simply to purify or cleanse, as Mr. Sawyer says, p. 1, then αγνίζω, *to purify*, or καθαρίζω, *to cleanse*, would have been the verb used. If sprinkling was the action, then ραντίζω would have been used. If pouring were the action commanded, then χέω would have been the word, and to sprinkle water on the feet, or pour it in the mouth, would have been equally valid baptism. If to wash the clothes were the action, then πλυνω would be the word. If washing the hands, *face* or feet were the action of baptism, then νιπτω would be the word. If bathing the body, by applying the water to wash or cleanse had been the action commanded, then λουω would have been the word. But as *dipping or immersing* is the action which God commanded, βαπτίζω is used in every instance where the action of baptism is spoken of; and I ask proof to the contrary.

Mr. Sawyer says, p. 2, "βαπτίζω, baptize, is a *frequentative* verb, derived from βαπτω, and according to its derivative form denotes frequency or repetition of the action signified." We reply, there are about 19,000 verbs in the Greek language, and about 3,400 of these end in ζω; yet probably not a dozen frequentatives can be found in the whole. Therefore if this verb has a frequentative meaning, it is not derived from the law of formation; and if derived from special usage, it is of modern invention. Would the limits of this work allow it, we could quote hundreds of eminent

scholars, to prove that repeated baptisms are not required by the force of the word. Tertulian says,—“Thence we are thrice immersed, [*ter mergitamus*,] fulfilling somewhat more [*amplius aliquid respondent*] than the Lord has decreed in the gospel.”—*Tertulian corona Militis*, chapt. 3.

And as Mr. Sawyer allows βαπτίζω to be the word employed, if he could prove it to be a frequentative, he would only show that baptism, whatever the action is, should be repeated.

Having clearly shown that the derivatives of βαπτω are the only words used in the Bible to denote baptism, and that baptism is one unchangeable action; to determine the meaning of βαπτω, βαπτίζω, βαπτισμα, βαπτισμος, &c., we introduce the following testimony:

I.—LEXICONS.

Mr. Sawyer says, p. 2, “The mode of baptism is not to be determined by a hasty reference to Greek lexicons, or the testimony of professed Greek scholars and Professors. It requires an investigation of the original words applied to denote this rite, in the writings where they occur. By this means we ASCEND BEYOND THE LEXICONS, and are enabled to judge for ourselves.” When Mr. S. says *he ascends beyond* the lexicons, he must mean that he ascends beyond the *authors* of the lexicons. It is possible, however, that some of these Greek authors and *Professors*, who were the ablest of native Greek scholars, would scarcely be willing to learn the meaning of Greek verbs at Mr. Sawyer’s feet. The fact that pedobaptist lexicons render βαπτίζω *immerse*, is an evidence that popular literature lives above sectarian prejudices.

“We appeal to the vocabulary and lexicon for the meaning of the term. We have the literal meaning of it fixed by all Greece; and if any other baptism had been intended by our Lord, the intentional departure from the common acceptation of the word would have been frankly and honestly stated.”

'If the meaning of the word is immerse, then immersion and nothing else will do; for it would be folly for me to attempt to immerse a man by sprinkling him.'

Edward Beecher, President of Jacksonville College.

We shall now see why Mr. Sawyer feared the lexicons.

'βαπτίζω, properly immergo ac intingo in aquam mergo; to immerse, to dip, to plunge into water.'

Schleusner's Lex.

'βαπτίζω, in its primary and radical sense; I cover with water. It is used to denote, 1st, I plunge or sink completely under water.'

Ewing's Lex.

'βαπτίζω, plunge, to plunge in water, to dip.'

John Jones' Lex.

'βαπτίζω, mergo, immergo.'

S. Patrick's Lex.

'Baptistrum, a bath into which persons are plunged.'

A. Adams' Lex.

'Baptisma and baptismus, βαπτω, die tauffe.'

A. Buchener's Lex.

'Baptism in theology is formed from the Greek βαπτίζω, I dip, I plunge.'

Dr. Reese's Cyclopædia.

'Baptism, formed of βαπτίζω, of βαπτω; I dip, or plunge. In primitive times the ceremony was performed by immersion.'

E. Chalmer's Cyclopædia.

'βαπτίζω, to dip, to plunge, to immerse in water.'

J. Parkhurst's Lex.

'Baptism, βαπτισμος, to dip or immerse.'

Calmet's Dict.

'βαπτίζω, mergo, immergo.'

B. Hedrici Lex.

'Mergo, to dip, plunge.'

Cole's Latin Dict.

'Immergo, to plunge, or dip over head and ears.'

W. Young's English and Latin Dict.

'Mergo, to dip, to sink.'

Rider's Latin Dict.

'βαπτίζω, proprie saepius intingo submergo in aquam, immergo.'

C. G. Bretschneider's Lex.

'Intingo, to dip in, to steep in, or color.'

W. Young's English and Latin Dict.

'Mergo, I dip, immergo, I dip in, plunge over head.'

C. Cellario, Latin Dict.

'Baptizo, to dip all over.'

W. Young's Latin and English Dict.

'βαπτίζω, to dip, immerse, submerge, sink.'

Pickering's Lex.

'Baptism, that is dipping, immersing, from the Greek βαπτίζω.' American Encyclopedia.

'βαπτω, to dip, to plunge into water; βαπτίζω, to immerse.' J. Donegan's Lex.

'Baptism, in the apostolic age, was performed by immersion.' Edinburgh Encyclopedia.

'βαπτίζω, to dip, to plunge into; as what for the sake of dyeing or washing we plunge into water.'

Scapula Lex

'βαπτίζω, mergo, lavo.' Schrevelius Lex.

'βαπτίζω, immergo, mergo, intingo.'

Budocus and Constantine's Lex

'βαπτίζω, immergo; βαπτισμος, immersio.'

Hadrian Junius Lex

'βαπτω, to dip in, to immerse; βαπτίζω, to submerge, sink.'

E. Robinson's Lex.

'βαπτω, to dip, plunge, immerse; βαπτίζω, to immerse, submerge, sink.'

G. Greenfield's Lex.

'βαπτίζω has but one signification; it signifies literally and invariably to plunge.'

Stourda Lex.

These and hundreds more must come to Mr. Sawyer, and learn the meaning of βαπτίζω; for he has *ascended far beyond them*, and has found out that baptize means to sprinkle.

II.—CLASSICAL USE OF βαπτω.

'As when a smith to harden an iron hatchet or pole-ax, βαπτει (*dips*) it in cold water.'

Homer's *Odyssey*, book 9, line 392

'An Egyptian considers the touch of a swine so polluting, that if he comes in contact with one he goes immediately to the river and ἐβαψε, (*plunges*) himself with his clothes.'

Herodotus, 2, 47

'Let the food be cakes ἐμ βαπτομενοι (*dipped*) hot in sour wine.'

Hippocrates de Vict. rat. page 104

'The bucket must first be βαπσαι, *dipped*, then drawn up.'

Aristotle *Quaest Mech.* chapt. 29.

I could quote thousands who thus use the word.

III.—CLASSIC USE OF βαπτίζω.

βαπτίζω baptize, as used by the classic Greek writers, signifies to dip, to immerse in a liquid.

L. A. Sawyer's CRITICAL DISSERTATION, p. 3.

'The young man was sent to Jericho, and there according to his (Herod's) order, βαπτιζομενος being dipped in a pool till he came to his end.'

Josephus' war, book 1, chapt. 22, sec. 2.

'Killing some on the land and βαπτιζοντων plunging others in the Lake. Heliodorus' Ethiopia, lib. 1, chapt. 30, p. 55.

'For it does not befall the things which can not swim βαπτιζεσθαι to be immersed; but they swim on the surface like wood.'

Stabo's Geog., lib. 9, p. 421.

'Such a storm suddenly pervaded all the country, that the ships that were in the Tiber were immersed or sunk τα πολοια εν τω τιβερι ιδι βαπτισθηραι.'

Dion Cassius, vol. 1, p. 148.

Great effort is made by pedobaptists to show that βαπτίζω means something else beside immerse. But if this could be done, what would be gained. Our English word DIP, has about twenty different meanings, yet when the word is used in reference to baptism, both baptists and pedobaptists fix a definite meaning to it. But the word βαπτίζω baptize, has but one meaning; hence not only use, but the etymology of the word compel us to render it immerse and nothing else.

IV.—THE SACRED USE OF βαπτω.

βαπτω baptō, as used in the septuagint, is generally a translation of the Hebrew word טָבַל *taval*, and signifies to dip, to immerse.'

L. A. Sawyer's CRITICAL DISSERTATION, p. 3.

Luke. xvi. 24; 'Send Lazarus that he may βαπτῃ dip the tip of his finger.'

John xiii. 26; 'He it is to whom I will give the sop when I have βαψας dipped it.'

Matt. xxvi. 23; 'He that εμβαψας dippeth his hand with me in the dish.'

Rev. xix. 13: 'clothed with a vesture *βεβαμμενο* dipped in blood.'

Thus we find *βαπτω* rendered dip in every instance in the New Testament.

V.—THE SACRED USE OF *βαπτίζω*.

As this word is not translated in the New Testament, we will let our pedobaptist bretheren say what it means. Of *βαπτίζω* Mr. Sawyer says, '2 Kings v. 14 where it is a translation of *טבל* taval, to dip.'

CRITICAL DISSERTATION, p. 4

'It is a matter of indifference whether one is washed in a pool, river, fountain, lake or bath, nor is there any difference between those whom John immersed (tinxit) in the Jordon, or Peter in the Tiber.

Terulian Militis, sect. 4

'You were asked, dost thou believe in God Almighty? thou saidst, I believe; and thus thou (mersisti) wast immersed.'

Ambrose De Sacr. lib 2, chapt. 7.

'The word *βαπτίζω*, both in sacred authors and in classical, signifies to dip, to plunge, to immerse.'

Campbell's 4 Gospels, note on Matt. iii. 11.

'το βαπτισμα εν τρισι καταδυσει τελειται baptism is performed by three immersions.'

Theophylact's comm. on Mark 8.

'The Apostolic church baptized only by immersion.'

Bretschneider's Theol. Vol 2, p. 684.

'It can not be denied that the native signification of the word *βαπτειν* and *βαπτίζειν* is to plunge, to dip.'

Witsius' Econ. of Cov., Lib. 4, chapt. 16, Sect. 13.

'The Greek church in all its branches, does still use immersion.'

Dr. Wall's hist. of Infant bapt., vol. 2, p. 376.

'*βαπτω* is a perfect immersion; *βαπτίζω* is to sink nearly to the bottom in water.

Kaiser Bib. Theol vol. 2, p. 162.

'Matt. iii. 6, A great part of these who went out to hear John, were baptized, that is dipped in Jordan.'

Pool's Annotations

'Baptism was originally by immersion.'

Dr. Neander's ch. hist. vol 1 part 2, p. 364.

'Trine immersion represents the three days burial of Christ.'

Leo, Bishop of Rome, Decret 9.

'That the Apostles immersed whom they baptized,

there is no doubt; and that the ancient church followed their example is very clearly evinced by innumerable testimonies of the Fathers.

G. I. Vossius De bapt. 1 sect. 6.

'I admit that the original signification of βαπτίζω is immersion.'

Dr. Janeways letters on bapt.

'Acts viii. 38, probably he plunged himself under the water, as this was the plan generally followed by the Jews.'

Dr. A. Clark's Comment.

'The person, in great simplicity is let down into the water, and with a few words said is dipped.'

Tertulian De Baptismo, chap. 12.

'The word βαπτίζω signifies to dye by dipping.'

Beza on Matthew iii. 11.

'The act of baptizing is the immersion of believers in water; this expresses the force of the word: thus also it was performed by Christ and his apostles.'

Vitrina's Theol. Aphoris. 884.

'The original and natural signification of the word βαπτίζω, imports to dip, to plunge.'

Ridgley's Body of Divinity.

'The Greeks defend immersion as is manifest, and has been frequently observed by learned men.'

Buddeus Theol. Dogm. lib. 5, chap. 1, sec. 3.

'In the primitive church baptism was a total immersion, or burial as it were.'

Bechmann's Theol. p. 632, A. D. 1696.

'Howbeit the very word of baptizing signifieth to dip, and it is certain that the manner of dipping was used of the old church.'

Calvin's Inst. p. 650, London, A. D. 1611.

'Christ commanded us to be baptized, by which word it is certain immersion is signified.'

Beza's Epist. 2 Anotation on Mark vii. 4.

'It is certain that both John the baptist and Jesus Christ practiced immersion, whose example was followed by the ancient church, as Vossius has shown by producing many testimonies from the Greek and Latin writers.'

Witsius' Econ. of Gov. lib. 4, chap. 16, sec. 13.

'βαπτίζω, to dip.'

Encyclopedia Britannica.

'βαπτίζω, to dip, to plunge, to immerse.'

A. Rees' Encyclopedia.

‘This was the ancient rite of baptizing, that they should be immersed in water, which even the word βαπτίζω sufficiently declares.’

I. Causabon in Whitaker's Testament, A. D. 1633.

‘Baptism by immersion was undoubtedly the apostolic practice.’ Bowers' Hist. of the Popes, vol. 2, p. 110.

‘Matt. iii. 1, (**Zu der zeit kam Johannes der Tauffer.**) in those days came John the dipper.’

M. Luther's Testament.

‘The persons to be baptized, after they had repeated the creed, &c. were immersed under water, and received into Christ's kingdom by a solemn invocation of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, according to the express command of our blessed Lord.’

Mesheim's Church Hist. cent. 2, part 2, sec. 13.

‘Being thrice overwhelmed in the water and again raised from it, we imitate the burial and resurrection of Christ.’ Gregory Nyssen Orat. cat. 35.

‘The Greek word βαπτίζω signifies *immergo*, that is to plunge, and dip in, and that was the proper use of water baptism among the Jews, and also by John and the primitive christians.’ R. Barkley's Apol. p. 440.

‘The custom of ancient churches was not to sprinkle, but immersion, in pursuance to the sense of the word βαπτίζω, in the command and example of our Saviour.’ Dr. I. Taylor's Bib. Infant Bapt. p. 693.

‘The name baptism is a Greek word and may be termed a dipping: as when we dip something in water that it may be wholly covered.’

M. Luther's Latin Essay on Bapt. tome 1, fol. 71.

‘The Germans learned effusion, and afterwards changed it further from the primitive mode of immersion, into mere sprinkling.’

Dr. Wall's Defence, p. 403.

‘The original mode of administering Christian baptism, was the same that had obtained among the Jews in the baptizing of proselytes; that is, by washing or immersing the whole body in water.’

S. Seabury, bishop of Conn. Discourse p. 94.

'We represent our Lord's sufferings and ascension by baptism in a pool.'

Justin Martyr, *Questio* 13. 7.

'By three immersions we represent the death of Christ.'

Basil the Great, *De Spiritu Sancto* 18.

'Acts ii, 38: And be baptized; that is, let every one of you, struck with a sorrow for your sins, be *plunged* in the water; because that sacred immersion has been established by Christ.'

C. M Du Veil's Latin Works, Claude's translation.

'The English Church practiced immersion down to the beginning of the 17th century, when a change to the method of sprinkling gradually took place, and in confirmation of this, see the first Liturgy published in 1547, which enjoins trine immersion.'

I. Floyer's *Essay on baptism*, p. 50.

'Feb. Saturday 21st, 1736, Mary Welch aged eleven days, was baptized according to the custom of the first church and the rule of the church of England, by immersion. Wednesday May 5th, 1736, I was asked to baptize a child of Mr. Parker, second balif of Savannah. But Mrs. Parker said, neither me nor Mr. Parker will consent to its being dipped. I answered, if you will certify that the child is weak it will suffice, (the Rubric says,) to pour water on it. She replied, nay, the child is not weak; but I am resolved that it shall not be dipped. So I went home, and the child was baptized by another person.'

J. Wesley's *Journal* in his Works, Vol. 1, pp. 25—30.

'Immersion was practiced by the church for 1000 years, except in cases of dangerous illness.'

Bishop Smith's *Sermon*, Lexington, Kentucky, in 1838

'We nowhere read in Scripture of any ones being baptized but by immersion; and from acts of councils and ancient Rituals, several authors have proved that this manner of immersion continued as much as possible to be used for 1300 years after Christ.'

Stackhouse's *hist. of Bible*, Book 8, Chapt. 1.

'We follow the example of the Apostles, who immersed the candidate under water.'

Critopulus *Confession of Faith*, chapt. 7.

'In the Greek Church, baptism is performed by immersion, and it is repeated three times.——The Greeks so firmly believe that sprinkling of water on the head among us is not sufficient for baptism, that they *rebaptize* the Latins who embrace their communion.'

Tournefort's Voyages, Vol. 1, p. 132.

'Baptism is administered among the Armenians by immersion.'

Tournefort's Voyage au Levant, Vol. 3, p. 247.

'Baptism relates to the death of Christ; the water answers to the grave, the immersion represents our dying with him, the emersion our rising with him.'

Apostolic constitutions, Lib. 3, Chapt. 17.

'Baptism is an entire action, to wit, a dipping; and the pronouncing of these words, I baptize thee in the name of the Father &c.'

Saxon Conf. of Faith, by Melanct. in 1551.

'All the Christians in Asia, all in Africa, and about one third part of Europe immerse.'

Dr. Wall's hist. of Bapt. Part 2, Chapt. 9, p. 477.

'I have heard a disputant of this stamp, in defiance of etymology and use, maintain that the word rendered baptize means more properly to sprinkle than to plunge. One who argues in this manner never fails, with persons of knowledge, to betray the cause they would defend; and though with respect to the vulgar, bold assertions succeed as well as arguments, yet candid minds will disdain to take the help of a falsehood even in support of truth.'

Dr. Campbell's Lecture on Pulpit Eloquence, p. 480.

'Baptizing in ancient times was by immersion; this is so plain and clear, from an infinite number of passages, that one can not but pity the weak endeavors of such pedobaptists as would maintain the negative of it.'

Dr. Wall's History of Baptism, vol. 2, p. 351.

'No *honest* man who understands the Greek language can deny the word (*βαπτίζω*) to signify to dip.'

Dr. Owen's Posthumous Works, p. 581.

'The disciples of our Lord could understand his command in no other manner than as enjoining immersion, for the baptism of John, to which Jesus him-

self submitted, and also the earlier baptism of the disciples of Jesus, were performed by dipping the subject into cold water, as is evident from Matt. iii. 6: *εβαπτισαντο εν τω Ιορδανη*, were baptized in Jordan. Matt. iii. 16: *Ιησοῦς ανεβη ευθυσ απο του υδατος*, Jesus ascended out of the water.' Storrs' Bib. Theol.

SECTION VII.

Baptism a burial.

THAT baptism is explained as a *burial* and *planting* by God himself, is fatal to the sprinkling scheme; for how can a man be buried by putting a little water on his face. The Saviour foreseeing that some men would fall into this error, determined to leave them without excuse, therefore Paul was inspired to make two faithful comments on *βαπτίζω* and its derivatives. That Rom. vi. 3—5. and Col. ii. 12, are such inspired explanations, is conceded by all intelligent *pedobaptists*, of which the following are specimens:—*Συνθαπτω*, to be buried as another has been buried, Rom. vi. 4, *Συνεταφημεν ουν αυτω δια του βαπτισματος εις τον θανατον αυτου*. Col. ii. 12, *Συνεταφευτες αυτω εν τω βαπτισματι*. He here compares the baptism of Christians, in which they were probably *immersed in water*, to the burial of Jesus, and as Jesus rose from the grave to a new and more exalted state of existence than he exhibited on earth, so their rising from the water,' &c. E. Robinson's Lex. *Συνθαπτω*.

'Anciently those who were baptized, were immersed and buried in water to represent their death to sin, and then did rise up out of the water, to signify their entrance upon a new life, and to these customs the apostle alludes, Rom. vi. 2—6.'

'The plunging into water signifieth that we die and are buried with Christ as concerning the old life of sin.'

Win. Tyndall's Obedience of a Christian Man, p. 143.

'It seems the part of candor to confess that here is an allusion to the manner of baptizing by immersion.'

Dr. Doddridge's Exposition, Romans vi. 3-4.

'Immersion was religiously observed by all Christians for thirteen centuries, and was changed into sprinkling without any authority from the author of this institution. It were to be wished that this custom were again in general use.

Dr. Whithy's Comment. on Romans, vi. 4.

'Rom. vi. 4. There is here plainly a reference to the ancient mode of baptism by immersion, and I agree with Koppe and Rosenmuller that there is reason to regret it should have been abandoned by most christian churches.'

Eloomfield's Critical Digest.

'In baptism, by a kind of analogy or resemblance, while our bodies are under the water we may be said to be buried with him.'

Bishop Nicholson's Exposition of Church Catechism, p. 174.

'That baptism was performed not by sprinkling but by immersion is evident not only from the nature of the word, but from Rom. vi. 4.'

Prof. Fritsche's Comment. on Matthew iii. 6.

SECTION VIII.

The Savior's Baptism an Example for Believers.

'If the baptism of Jesus Christ was intended as an example for Christians you ought to follow it.'

Win. T. Hamilton's Anabaptism Disproved, p. 12.

'Baptism was instituted and consecrated by God, and the first that baptized was John who dipped Christ in the water in Jordan.'

Helvetia Conf. Faith, written by Bucer, A. D. 1536: repub. Zurich, A. D. 1660.

'Jesus submitted to be baptized, that is buried under the water, by John, and to be raised out of it again, as an emblem of his future death and resurrection.'

Macknight's Apostolic Epistles, note on Rom. vi. 4.

‘Our Lord would be baptized that he might conciliate authority to the baptism of John, that by his *example* he might commend and sanctify our baptism.’

Witsium

‘Matt. iii. 15, Thus it becometh *us*, &c. We never find that Jesus spake of himself in the *plural number*, and we must therefore allow he meant John also, and all God’s servants. It became Christ, our surety and *example*, perfectly to fulfil all righteousness: and it becometh us to walk in God’s commandments without exception.’

Dr. Scott’s Comment.

Some persons think they must wait a while after they are converted, to see if they can live like a Christian, before they are baptized. But this is evidently wrong; for how can we live like a Christian in disobedience. In the Savior’s commands there is no duty enjoined between believing and being baptized: Matt. xxviii. 19, ‘Teach all nations, baptizing them.’ Mark xvi. 16, ‘He that believeth and is baptized.’ Accordingly in the practice of the apostles there are examples of persons being baptized the same hour of the night in which they believed; and there is no example of any waiting as long as *three days*, excepting Paul, Acts ix. 8—19: verse 9, ‘And he was three days without sight, and neither did eat nor drink;’ yet Ananias severely rebuked him for delaying his baptism so long: Acts xxii. 16, ‘Now why tarriest thou, arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins.’ Acts ix. 18—19, ‘And immediately there fell from his eyes as it had been scales, and he received sight forthwith, and arose and was baptized, and when he had received meat he was strengthened.’ Paul’s being blind and so ill as not to take any food, would appear like an apology for his delaying baptism; yet the Holy Spirit moved Ananias to make no allowance, but to rebuke his delay: ‘Now why tarriest thou.’ In all other instances where the ordinance is mentioned we find that the convert

was baptized the *same day* that he believed : Acts ii. 38, 'Repent and be baptized.' Acts ii. 41, 'Then they that gladly received his word were baptized, and *the same day* there were added about three thousand souls.' Acts viii. 35—38, 'The Eunnuch was baptized immediately.' Acts xvi. 15, 'Lydia did not delay.'—Acts xvi. 33, 'The jailor was baptized the same hour of the night.' Acts xviii. 8, 'Many of the Corinthians hearing, believed and were baptized.' Hence this joining a six month class paper, or being propounded for one, two, or three months, is without any Bible precept or example, and is wholly opposed to the scriptures. It should be remembered that we are accountable for sins of omission as well as commission : Matt. v. 19, 'Whosoever, therefore, shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven : but whoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven.'

1st John ii. 6, 'He that saith he abideth in him ought himself also so to walk, even as he walked.'—John xiv. 15, 'If ye love me keep my commandments.' Luke vi. 46, 'Why call ye me, *Lord, Lord*, and do not the things which I say.' 2 John 6, 'This is love, that ye walk after his commandments.' Luke xiv. 33, 'Whosoever he be of you that forsaketh not all that he hath, he can not be my disciple.' Matt. xix. 29, 'And every one that hath forsaken houses, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my name's sake, shall receive an hundredfold, and shall inherit everlasting life.'—Mark viii. 34, 'Whosoever will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me.' Luke xiv. 27, 'And whosoever doth not bear his cross, and come after me, can not be my disciple.'

SECTION IX.

Baptism a Saving Ordinance.

It has been said that Baptists esteem immersion a saving ordinance. We reply, no ordinance saves.— Jesus Christ alone saves, by grace, through faith; and the Baptists are so far from believing this ordinance saving, that none are admitted to it but those who give satisfactory evidence of piety. But the following extracts will show what efficacy pedobaptists give to sprinkling:

‘Whoever denies that infants by Christian baptism are delivered from *perdition*, and brought to *eternal salvation*, let him be *anathema*.’

Council of Carthage, Wall’s Hist. Bapt. part 1, p. 247.

‘If any one shall say that baptism is not necessary to salvation, let him be *anathema*.’

Council Trident Session 7, Cann. 5.

‘Christ has nothing to do with any man, nor any man with Christ, till he is baptized with water. All power in heaven and earth is in baptism. He that is not baptized has no interest in Father, Son, nor Spirit. He who is baptized is as white and clean from sin as God can make him.’

Lewelyn’s Treatise on Bapt. pp. 5, 11, 23.

‘In baptism we are regenerated, justified and sanctified while yet infants.’

Faith of the Church of England, New-York Evangelist, Sept. 8; 1833.

‘From this it follows of course, agreeably to the terms of that covenant, (the covenant of grace,) that infants are entitled to baptism; and that the *blessings of that covenant are forfeited* by a neglect to practice infant baptism.’

L. A. Sawyer’s CRITICAL DISSERTATION, p. 19.

‘By baptism, we, who are by nature the children of wrath, are made the children of God.’

John Wesley’s Works, vol. 6, p. 16.

‘It was the sprinkling of the blood of the Paschal lamb on the door posts of their houses which preserved

the Israelites from the destroying angel. So baptism when truly received *saves* from everlasting ruin.

Evan. Mag. (presbyterian) Hartford, June 1838, p. 547. See, also, Presbyterian Conf. Faith, pp. 111, 112, and Episcopal Book of Common Prayer, under Public Baptism of Infants and the Catechism.

CHAPTER VI.

THE LORD'S SUPPER.

THE word communion is used in connection with the Lord's Supper but in one instance: 1 Cor. x. 16, 'The cup of blessing, which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ?' and here it is not used to denote the Lord's Supper, but the *fellowship* which Christians have with the blood and body of Christ, in partaking of the supper. κυριακον δειπνον, *Lord's Supper*, at 1 Cor. xi. 20; is entirely a different thing from κοινωνια, *communion*, 1 Cor. x. 16. This latter word means, and is most usually rendered *fellowship*: as at Acts ii. 42: 1 Cor. i. 9: 2 Cor. viii. 4: Gal. ii. 9: Eph. iii. 9: Phil. i. 5: ii. 1: iii. 10: 1 John i. 3: *communion* is used to denote a friendly interchange and unity of sentiments: Gen. xxiii. 8, Abraham and the sons of Heth: Gen. xlii. 24, Joseph and his brethren: 1 Saml. xviii. 22, Saul's servants and David: 1 Saml. xix. 3, Jonathan and Saul: Job iv. 2, Job and Eliphaz: Psl. lxiv. 5, David's enemies: Luke vi. 11, The pharisees: Luke xxii. 4, Judas and the chief priests: Acts xxiv. 26, Felix and Paul: according to the inspired use of the word *communion*, close communion is only applicable to such Christians as decline all friendly intercourse; and how far this is applicable to pedobaptists we leave the reader to judge; open communion and close communion are not scriptural terms: but as their meaning is generally known, we shall use them to avoid circumlocution. Christian fellowship and Church fellowship are two things: the

former may be perfect where the latter does not exist, and no denomination has church fellowship for another distinct sect, although they may have Christian fellowship for each of its members. 'In the Westminster confession they distinguish between church communion and Christian communion. By the first, viz. church communion, they understand communion with a church in her social character as organized under a particular form of doctrine, government, and worship. By the second, viz. the communion of saints, or Christian communion, they understand that communion which subsists between Christians as individuals without reference to their church connexion at all.'

Dr. J. M. Mason's plea, pp. 225, 229.

There are several religious duties which are the acts of individual Christians: such as preaching, prayer, singing, alms giving, visiting, &c.; others are church acts and can not be performed by individuals: as licensing and ordaining ministers, ordaining deacons, administering and receiving the *Lord's supper*, receiving, disciplining and excluding members, settling and dismissing pastors, &c.; no pedobaptist denomination invites other sects to join with them in all these *church acts*. But shall we therefore call them bigoted and close communion. If I should appear at a Methodist ordination, or a Congregational church meeting, and insist on taking an active part, alledging that it was the Lord's church meeting, and the Lord's minister to be ordained; I should act as consistent as they do who urge open communion for the same reason.

The elements of the Lord's supper must be bread and wine; Matt. xxvi. 26, 29: 1 Cor. xi. 23, 26.—The command and example of Christ is the law of this institution from which no church is at liberty to depart. We are not directed how often to repeat this sacrament, but 1 Cor. xi. 26, 'As often as ye do eat this bread and drink this cup.' In baptism the burial and resurrec-

tion of the Savior is set forth: and the Lord's supper represents his sufferings and death: thus, in the two sacraments we commemorate the sufferings, death, burial, and resurrection of the Lord. The communicants must be baptized believers regularly admitted to *church fellowship*: as also the administrator: 'The primitive Christians never received the Lord's supper but from the hands of *their bishop*, or from one appointed by him.' Tertulian de Corona Militis p. 338.

Some persons suppose that they can partake of the Lord's supper with sects holding erroneous sentiments, and not thereby fellowship their errors, and say that partaking with them is only joining in that one action. But 'as the sacramental supper is *the act of a church* in her social character, we do by the very fact of communing with her, acknowledge her as a *whole*: and thus by implication at least, put the seal of our approbation to *whatever belongs to her as a church*.'

Dr. J. M. Mason's Plea, p. 236.

Hence partaking with a church is publicly declaring a fellowship for the whole faith and practice of that church.

The custom of giving the Lord's supper to infants originated at Alexandria, in Egypt, in the third century, and continued in use till the Council of Constance, June 14, 1415. The scholastic divines supposed it was essential to salvation, from a wrong interpretation of John vi. 53, 54. They administered it by mixing the bread and wine in a spoon, and uniformly gave it to all they baptized; for the Catholics, using common sense, saw that if the candidate was fit for one he was for both sacraments.

'In the ancient church those two sacraments were never separated the one from the other. Infants in the third century were generally admitted to baptism and the Lord's supper.'

Venema's Hist. Ecclesiast. secul. 2, sect. 100.

'It is manifest that in the ancient church it was usual

to give the eucharist to infants, which custom arose about the third century.

Budeus' Theol. Dogm. book 5, chapter 1, section 19.

'No objection can be made to this custom but what may with equal force be made to the custom of baptizing infants.'

Dr. Prestly's Address on Giving the Lord's Supper to Children, p. 31.

'The visible church consists of all that profess the true religion, together with their *children*, and is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ; out of which there is no ordinary possibility of salvation; the parties baptized are solemnly admitted into the visible church; baptism is not to be administered to any that are out of the visible church; but infants descending from parents both or but one of them professing faith in Christ and obedience to him, are in that respect within the covenant and are to be baptized. All baptized persons are members of the church, are under its care, and subject to its discipline; and when they have arrived at the years of discretion they are bound to perform *all the duties* of church members. Children born within the pale of the visible church, and dedicated to God in baptism, are under the inspection and government of the church, and when they come to years of discretion, if they be free from scandal, appear sober and steady, and have a sufficient knowledge to discern the Lord's body, they ought to be informed that it is their duty and their privilege to come to the Lord's supper.'

Presbyterian Confession of Faith, pp. 111, 287, 392, 436.

'During their minority which reaches till they are more than thirteen years, according to the example of Ishmael, and till about sixteen years of age, they are really members to such intents and purposes as that if their parents are dismissed to other churches, their children ought to be put into the letters of dismission with them.'*

Dr. J. Cotton's Essay on the Holiness of Ch. Members, p. 19.

*The above doctrine having been fully preached in a presbyterian church in the state of New-York, and the children not

'It is objected further that all baptized persons are by that class of Christians to whom I have attached myself, considered as members of the Christian church; yet those who are baptized in infancy, are not treated as if they possessed that character; particularly, they are not admitted to the sacramental supper: nor made objects of ecclesiastical discipline. As this objection has in my own view, a more serious import than any other which has been alledged, it deserves particular consideration. In the first place, I *acknowledge* without hesitation, that the conduct of those with whom I am in immediate communion, and so far as I know their opinions also, with regard to this subject, are in a greater or less degree *erroneous* and indefensible.'

Dwight's Theol. Sermon, 157.

From the above it is obvious that infant communion was the practice of the Romish church; and that pedobaptists have adopted the sentiment in their confessions of faith, but refuse to reduce it to practice.— See also Zornius' Hist. Euchar. Infantum: Robinson's Claude: Watt's Ruin and Recovery: Edwards on Original Sin: and Ridgeley's Bod Divi. vol. I. While there was but one denomination the Lord's supper was administered to all its members; but when Arius and his party went off, the true Church refused to commune with them; when the church of Rome became corrupt, the true church refused to commune with them; when the Lutherans and Calvinists left the Roman catholics, the Romish church refused to commune with them, and they refused to commune with the church of Rome, and the true church refused to commune with all these sects. 'In a letter, in 1535,

invited to the Lord's table, on one sacramental occasion, in A. D. 1832, while the church was celebrating the Lord's supper, a number of these young church members assembled in the gallery, and attended to the communion among themselves, by administering and receiving pieces of *pumpkin* in the name of the Lord.

to the brethren of the Waldenses (the true church) in Bohemia, Melancthon thus writes, 'Since we agree in the principal articles of Christian doctrine let us embrace each other.' Dr. J. M. Mason's Plea, p. 167.

But the Waldenses positively refused to communicate with these heterodox sects.

The council of Trent, which continued from 1547 to 1564, thus paraphrased the Savior's words, Luke xxii. 19, '*This do,*' 'That is receive the power of converting these elements of bread and wine, into the true and proper substance of my body and blood: and offering them up to my Father, a propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead;' this is called transubstantiation.

Council Trident, sess. 13, chapt. 1, can. 4, sess. 22, can. 2, 3.

The Lutherans invented the doctrine of consubstantiation, which affirms that 'with the bread is exhibited that body of Christ which was delivered for us; and with the wine is exhibited that blood which is the basis of the new testament.' But this was so offensive to the Calvinists (Presbyterians) that they would not commune with the Lutherans. 'John Knox accepted at Frankfort on the Maine, the charge of a congregation of English exiles; and when the congregation had agreed to adopt the order of the Geneva church, and requested him to proceed to administer the communion according to it, although he approved of that order he declined to carry it into effect.' Dr. J. M. Mason's Plea, p. 185.

A pious Scotchman, now residing in this city, who was a member of the Scotch church for many years, says 'In Scotland there are the following pedobaptist denominations, viz. the Established church, the Covenanters, the Relief church, the church of England, the Bergers and the Anti-Bergers, (now the United Cession church,) the Independents, the Wesleyan Methodist, and the Independent Methodist. Each of these

sects is close communion in every sense of the word. They never partake of the Lord's supper together; they all say, if we have reason to divide into different sects we can not unite in the Lord's supper, which is the most essential act of church fellowship.' It is thus evident that the Presbyterian churches in Scotland are emphatically close communion, and ever have been since the days of John Knox.

A question being asked president Edwards relating to the practice of European pedobaptists, in the use of the Lord's supper, he answers, 'The divines of Scotland, I find in many of their sermons, and other discourses, declare themselves to *strictness* in admission to the Lord's supper.—I might bring much to this purpose from Mr. Andrew Gray's book of sermons, 1716. So from Ebenezer Erskine's Synodical Sermon, 1732; and his discourse on *fencing the table*, annexed to his sermon on John xiv. 15. So from Mr. Williams' Synodical Sermon, 1733, where he sets down a variety of searching questions, no less than twenty-seven, which he advises to be put to proponents, and their answers waited for before they are admitted, (to the Lord's table.) And now to pass over to England: Mr. Baxter in his five disputations has much that runs in the same strain; so in his reformed liturgy, and in his Christian concord, where we have his brethren joining their testimony with his. Likewise, Mr. Charnock in his discourse on the Lord's supper. Mr. Palmer in his *scripture rail* to the Lord's table. Mr. Saunders in his *Antidiatribes*. Mr. Longley, Mr. Doolittle, Mr. Henry, Dr. Earl, and others, in their books on the Lord's supper.' President Edwards's Works, vol. 4, pp. 437, 439.

America was settled by different sects of pedobaptists, and that they were all close communion is evident from the heads of agreement entered into by the Presbyterians and Congregationalists at Saybrook, Sept. 9, 1708, established by law at New-Haven, Oct. 14, 1708,

and printed at New-London, 1710, in which they provide, chapt. 4, sect. 3, for opening communion, in these words, 'That known members of particular churches, constituted as aforesaid, may have *occasional communion* with each other in the ordinances of the gospel, viz. the *word, prayer, sacrament, and singing psalms*.' 'Such an event, it is believed, had never before occurred in the United States. The Presbyterian church in North America sprung immediately from the established church in Scotland; the associate reformed church, also, was founded in the union of ministers and people from the two branches of the secession in Scotland, and from the reformed presbytery; when they emigrated to this country it was not to be expected that the *esprit du corps*, their characteristic feeling, should perish in the Atlantic: and accordingly like the mother churches, they maintained not only *separate communions*, but much of their old reserve and distance.' Dr. J. M. Mason's Plea.

The colonies of Massachusetts and Connecticut, called a General Council, to discuss and settle a system of faith and practice, which convened at Boston, June 4, 1657. Among the questions discussed, the second was this, 'Whether communion of churches as such, be not warrantable by the word of God.—*Records of Conn.*' Trumbull's History, vol. 1, pp. 301, 303.

'The first ministers of Connecticut and New-England maintained that all the pastors' office power was confined to his own church and congregation, and that the administering of *baptism and the Lord's supper*, in other churches, was irregular.—*Hooker's Survey, part 2, pp. 62, 68.*' Trumbull's History, vol. 1, p. 283.

When the pedobaptists in America forsook the practice of their close communion mother churches in Europe, and established their united religion by law, it is evident that their design in uniting had not so much reference to their opening communion among

themselves, as to uniting their forces to persecute the Baptists and Quakers. New England, and especially New Haven, is the most *unhappy place* for pedobaptists to plead for communion with the Baptists. There are so many Presbyterian *blue laws* and *blue practices* fresh in recollection, that it is blushing work for them to name close communion. The first man that advocated Baptist sentiments in America, was the first that suffered violence. Roger Williams was *banished* from Salem, Mass. in 1634, by pedobaptist force and arms.

In 1639; some Baptists attempted to organize a church at Weymouth, 14 miles east of Boston. For this offense, the pedobaptists arrested John Smith, John Spur, Richard Sylvester, Ambrose Morton, Thomas Macpeace and Robert Lenthal, who were tried before the General court at Boston, March 13th, 1639 and fined from £20 to 20s. each, and threatened with banishment if they persisted. Benedict's Hist. p. 356.

The subsequent persecutions which the Baptists suffered in that section was under the following pedobaptist law, enacted by the General Court of Mass., Nov. 13, 1644. "It is ordered and agreed that if any person within this jurisdiction shall either openly condemn or oppose the baptizing of infants, or go about secretly to seduce others from the approbation or use thereof, or shall purposely depart the congregation at the administration of the ordinance, every such person or persons, shall be sentenced to BANISHMENT. See Records of Mass. General Court. Benedict's Hist. p 359

October 17th, 1643; Samuel Gorton, John Wickes, Randal Holden, Robert Potter, Richard Carder, Francis Weston, and John Warner, were tried by the General Court at Boston, for being Baptists, and sentenced to be shut up in separate prisons, and there to be set at work, and to wear such *bolts or irons* as may hin-

der their escape. These men were kept in prison until March 7th, 1644, and then **BANISHED** by order of the General Court, and forbidden to return under the penalty of *suffering death*. Backus' hist. Vol. 1, p. 126-129.

In 1644, a pedobaptist named Painter, who belonged to Hingham, turned Baptist, and refused to have his child sprinkled, for which offense by order of the court he was tied up and whipt. Backus' Hist. vol. 1, p. 151.

In July, 1651, three Baptist clergymen named, Clark, Holmes, and Moody, were arrested at Lynn ten miles north-east of Boston, while Clark was preaching, on the Lords day, and sent to the prison in Boston, where they lay two weeks, and were fined, one £30, one £20 and one £5, and sentenced to be *publicly whipped* if they refused to pay. How Moody got out we do not learn; Clark's fine was paid, but Holmes was whipt. John Spur and John Hazel, who were spectators, showed signs of sympathy at Holmes' bloody whipping, which led the pedobaptists to suspicion that Spur and Hazel were Baptists, and they were arrested at Boston, and each sentenced to pay 40 shillings and be publicly whipped. Benedict's hist. p. 364-376.

In 1655, Thomas Gould, Thomas Osborne, Edward Drinker, John George, Richard Goodall, William Turner, Robert Lambert, Mary Goodall, and Mary Newel, were imprisoned, some of whom were whipped, and others left to dreadful sufferings for denying infant baptism, and attempting to establish a Baptist Church in Boston. In May 1655, Thomas Gould, William Turner, and John Farnum, were **BANISHED** by sentence of the General Court, at Boston, and they refusing to leave the country, were imprisoned again. Through all these persecutions, the Baptists persevered and obtained a house to worship in. But the General Court passed a law to shut it up, and the Baptists found the following note on the door. "All persons are to take notice that by order

of the Court the doors of this house are shut up, and that they are inhibited to hold any meeting, or to open the doors thereof without license from authority, till the General Court take further order, as they will answer the contrary at their peril. Dated at Boston, 8th of March 1680. **EDWARD RAWSON, Secretary.**

Benedict's hist. 331-400.

Between the years 1727 and 1733, there were 28 Baptists, 2 Quakers, and 2 Episcopalians imprisoned at Bristol, Mass. (now R. I.) for Presbyterian priest tax.

Benedict's hist. p. 443.

In 1751, the Rev. Mr. Moulton was arrested for preaching Baptist sentiments in Sturbridge, Mass., and by public authority shut up in prison, and finally **BANISHED** as a vagrant and vagabond, and his deacon, Mr. Fisk, and bretheren, John Corey, Jeremiah Barstow, Josiah Perry, and John Draper, were imprisoned in Worcester Jail. The following property belonging to the members of that Baptist church, was taken and sold by authority, to pay the salary of the Rev. Caleb Rice, a Congregational priest. Cash, \$36, 7 cows, 1 heifer, 2 steers, 2 oxen, a flock of geese, 20 pewter plates, 1 tankard, 1 saddle, a trammel and hooks, shovel, tongs, and andirons, 1 pot, 1 kettle, 1 warming pan, and one broad axe.

Benedict's hist. p. 432, 433.

In 1770, about 400 acres of land, belonging to the members of the Baptist church, in Ashfield, were sold at auction, to pay Congregational priest tax.

Benedict's hist. p. 435.

So much for Puritan inquisition, and Massachusetts open communion.

We pass to Connecticut, and shall glance at her legalized persecutions. The following law was enacted by the General Court of Connecticut, in October, 1656. 'That no town within this Jurisdiction shall entertain any Quakers, Ranters, Adamites, or such like notorious heretics, nor suffer them to continue in

them above the space of 14 days, upon the penalty of £5.'

'In 1658, the Court of New Haven made a similar law increasing the penalties and *prohibiting all conversation* of the common people with any of those heretics (Quakers, Baptists, &c.) and all persons from giving them any entertainment upon penalty of £5.'

Trumbull's hist. of Ct. Vol. 1, p. 299, 300.

'And it is further enacted by the authority aforesaid, that whatsoever person not being a *lawfully allowed* (*Congregational*) minister of the gospel shall presume to profane the holy sacraments by administering or making a show of administering them to any person or persons whatsoever, and being thereof convicted before the county court in such county where such offense shall be committed, shall incur the penalty of £10, for every such offense, and suffer corporeal punishment by whipping, not exceeding thirty stripes for each offense.

Records of the State of Conn. Vol. 5, May 1723.

Trumbull's hist., vol. 2, p. 38.

In 1738, the Congregational church in Milford, Conn., divided; and one part employed Mr. Finley, a Presbyterian minister, as their pastor; but the Congregational part were so enraged at his Presbyterianism, that they transported him to New-Jersey, as a vagrant; (and I believe that the two churches in Milford, do not commune together to this day.)

Trumbull's History, vol. 2, p. 177.

In December, 1740, John Merriman, pastor of the Baptist church in Wallingford, invited the Rev. Philemon Robbins, pastor of the Congregational church in Branford, to preach for him. Mr. Robbins accepted the invitation, and preached to the Baptist church in Wallingford, January 6, 1741; for *this offense*, the New-Haven Congregational Association laid Mr. Robbins under *censure*, and finally *deposed* him from the ministry. A majority of the church at Branford deciding with their pastor, rather than with the New-

Haven Association, renounced the Saybrook and adopted the Cambridge platform; for *this act* the New-Haven Association held the Branford church under censure till 1748. Trumbull's History, vol. 2, pp. 196, 232.

In 1741, Rev. Mr. Humphreys, of Derby, Conn., a Congregational minister, had preached to a Baptist society, and *on that account* was soon after deprived of a seat in the New-Haven association.

Trumbull's History, vol. 2, p. 195.

In May 1742, the General Assembly of Connecticut enacted a law, of which the following is an extract :

"Whereas this assembly did by their act, made in the 27th year of Queen Anne, establish and confirm a confession of faith, and an agreement for ecclesiastical discipline, made at Saybrook in 1708, by the Rev. Elders and Messengers delegated by the churches in this colony ;———therefore be it enacted by the Governor, Council, and representatives in General Court assembled and by the authority of the same, that if any ordained minister, or any other person licensed as aforesaid to preach, shall enter into any parish not immediately under his charge, and shall there preach and exhort the people, he shall be denied and excluded the benefit of any law of this colony :———and it is further enacted by the authority aforesaid———that every such preacher, teacher, or exhorter, shall be sent as a vagrant person, by warrant from any assistant or justice of the peace, from constable to constable, out of the bounds of the colony."

Records of the Colony of Conn., 1742. Trumbull's hist. of Conn., vol. 2, p. 162-165.

In February, A. D. 1744, fourteen persons were arrested at Sayville, in the town of Saybrook, for holding a Baptist meeting : the charge brought against them was : "*for holding a meeting, contrary to law, on God's holy Sabbath-day.*" They were arraigned, tried, fined, and driven on foot, through a deep mud, to New-London jail, a distance of 25 miles, where

they were thrust into prison, without food, fire, or beds, and kept in dreadful sufferings for several weeks : and probably would have perished had not some Baptist brethren, residing at New-London, Great Neck, carried them provisions. One of the imprisoned was an infant, carried in her mother's arms ; which infant afterwards became the wife of Mr. Stephen Webb, of Chester. Another was an unconverted man by the name of Job Buckley ; the prayers, and Christian patience, with which these Christians bore their sufferings in jail, were blessed to his conversion ; when they were released they formed a church at Sayville, placing his name first on the list of the constituent members.

In 1744, the Congregational church in Canterbury, under the care of Rev. James Cogswell, divided : and a part organized on the Cambridge platform. John Cleaveland and Ebenezer Cleaveland, who were students in Yale College, visited Canterbury and attended the Cambridge meeting, and *for this offense they were both expelled* from college, Nov. 19, 1744.

Trumbull's History, vol. 2, pp. 178, 182.

November 23, 1744, the Rev. Mr. Humphreys, of Derby, Rev. Mr. Leavenworth, of Waterbury, and the Rev. Mr. Todd, of Northbury, ordained the Rev. Jonathan Lee, of Salisbury, who had adopted the Cambridge instead of the Saybrook platform. Mr. Lee was a man of distinguished abilities and piety ; but his embracing the *Cambridge platform* was so great an offense, that the New-Haven Association not only *refused to fellowship him*, but actually *suspended* the three above clergymen who ordained him, from all associational communion. Trumbull's History, vol. 2, p. 186.

It should be remembered that the whole colony was divided into parishes, and that the law had established the Saybrook platform as the religion of each parish ; so that the Baptist was not only deprived of all enter-

tainment, however willing to pay for it, and from all conversation with the people, but they could not preach the gospel or baptize in any part of the colony without preaching in a Congregational parish, and thus expose themselves to a fine of £10, a whipping of thirty stripes, and BANISHMENT from the colony as vagrants.

But notwithstanding all that we have suffered, and still suffer from our pedobaptist brethren, our refusing to commune with them is not a retaliation: but arises from a fear of deviating from the law of our Savior, which regulates this institution; and our design in publishing these facts is not to injure our persecutors, but simply to inquire who has the greatest cause to complain of close communion, and, where in reality is the practice found.

When the church of England broke off from the Roman Catholics they ceased to commune with them and all other sects. A pious Englishman residing in this city, has furnished me with the following information and documents: 'The church of England will not partake of the Lord's supper with any person who can not produce a certificate of his birth and baptism, from under the hand of the parish officer where he was born: and the baptism must have been administered by an Episcopal minister, and no other; the church must also have proof that the communicant has been confirmed in the Episcopal church, if not he can not be admitted to the Lord's supper. A certificate of birth and baptism from a dissenter will not be accepted, nor can any one gain admittance to the churchman's communion by it.

[COPY OF REGISTER.]

No. These are to certify that N. son of N. N. and S., his wife, who was daughter of N. N., was born at No. in street, in the parish of

because they had not been ordained by British Episcopal hands. We are the only true church, says the American Episcopalian, and if the different sects wish to partake of the Lord's supper from our priests' hands, thereby acknowledging us right, we will not prevent them; but we will not go and commune with Methodist and Presbyterian errors, neither can we, for their ministers are not lawfully ordained and prepared to administer. But after all their boasted Episcopal succession of bishops, they are obliged to acknowledge themselves dissenters from the Roman Catholics, as late as 1558; and if the Episcopalians are the *true church*, because of their apostolical ordinations, then for the same reason the Roman Catholics are the *true church*, yea, *more than the true church*, for the Episcopalians are mere dissenters from the Roman Catholics. But even the Catholics fail of their succession of bishops, for 'One extraordinary event afforded in the ninth century, a ludicrous interruption to the boasted succession of regular bishops from the days of St. Peter, the election of a *female Pope*, who is said to have ably governed the church, for three years, till detected by the birth of a child.'

Tytler's General History. p. 119.

Whatever pretensions Episcopalians make to open communion, it is certain that their creeds and tenets bind them to close communion, and other pedobaptists know it and treat them accordingly: 'Our readers have noticed that when we spoke of the ground assumed by the leading papers of the Episcopal church, in this country, in denying the ordinations of other churches, we have always said except the Catholics; and have also considered the doctrine of diocesan Episcopacy, and a distinction of ranks in the Christian ministry as the **RADICAL PRINCIPLE OF POPERY.**'

New-York Evangelist, August 8, 1838.

Can Presbyterians commune with the *radical principles of Popery*?

The Episcopal Methodists are close communion.—For information on this point, we are not to apply to some ignorant individual, or to the disorganizing practice of their churches; but to their discipline, published by authority; to illustrate the facts contained in their discipline, we will suppose that myself and wife resolve to partake of the Lord's supper with the Methodists: we go with their discipline in hand, open at chapt. 1, sect. 22. '*Of the Lord's Supper.*—Question. Are there any directions to be given concerning the Lord's supper? Ans. 2. LET NO PERSON THAT IS NOT A MEMBER OF OUR CHURCH be admitted to the communion without *examination*, and some *token* given by an elder or deacon.' We submit to the examination, and then ask what they mean by the word token. Ans. 'This may certify that my understanding of that clause in the discipline which requires an examination, and some token to be given by an elder or deacon, to entitle a person, *not of our church*, to commune *with us*, is that a TICKET, or CERTIFICATE should be given to such persons: signifying that he or she is considered worthy, and therefore is permitted to come to the communion table.' New-York, Oct. 2, 1834, (signed,) N. Bangs. With this instruction, we go to one of the elders, and petition for a *token or ticket*; he being faithful to his charge, opens the discipline and reads chapt. 2, sect. 6, '*Of Dress.*—Question. Should we insist on the rules concerning dress? Ans. By all means; this is no time to give any encouragement to superfluity of apparel; therefore *give no tickets to any* till they have left off superfluous ornaments—allow no exempt cases, better one suffer than many—give no tickets to any that wear *high heads, enormous bonnets, ruffles, or rings.*' Finding ourselves defeated, by reason of my wife's dress, she puts on a plain Quaker suit and returns, we meet the Methodist, and he now opens the Discipline

at chapt. 1, sect. 22, Ans. 3, and reads, '*No person shall be admitted to the Lord's supper among us, who is guilty of any practice for which we would exclude a member of our church.*' I now inquire, for what will you exclude your members? The Methodist inquires of me, 'Sir, art thou a Baptist minister?' I reply, I am. He then reads from the Discipline, chapt. 1, sect. 18, Quest. 3, '*What shall be done with those ministers, or preachers, who hold and disseminate publicly, or privately, doctrines, which are contrary to our articles of religion?*' Ans. Let the same process be observed as in cases of *gross immorality.*—The Discipline then proceeds to show how they must be dealt with, and if they do not repent, and embrace Methodism, they must be expelled from the church.—The Methodist now lifts up his eyes and asks me, 'Have you ever been guilty of *holding* or *disseminating* doctrines which are contrary to *our articles of religion?*' I reply, yes, sir, repeatedly; and am conscientiously bound to continue. The Methodist replies, then our Discipline says, chapt. 1, sect. 22, ans. 3. 'You can not have a seat at the Lord's table among us, for you are *guilty* of the same practices, for which we exclude our ministers.' My wife renews her request, and the Methodist opens the Discipline at chapt. 2, sect. 7, ans. 3, 'If a member of our church shall be clearly convicted of endeavoring to sow dissention, in any of our societies, by inveighing, against either *our doctrine or discipline*: such person so offending, shall be first reprov'd by the senior minister, or preacher of the circuit, and if he persist in such pernicious practice he shall be expelled from the church.' Madam, says the Methodist, did you ever speak against the Methodist doctrine, or discipline? My wife replies, I have repeatedly, and shall again. Well, says the Methodist, our Discipline says, chapt. 1, sect. 22, ans. 3. 'You can not be admitted to the Lord's supper

among us.' Thus the letter of the Discipline, shuts us out, and, not only us, but *all persons* who do not *believe, preach, and dress* like the Methodist. Again, to illustrate the fact that the Methodist Discipline is close communion: say, let a *perfect* Methodist sister put on an '*enormous bonnet, ruffles, and rings, and carry a high head;*' let her also embrace and declare the following doctrines: 'God, from all eternity, did by the most wise and holy counsel, of his own will, freely and unchangeably, ordain whatsoever comes to pass; by the decree of God, for the manifestation of his glory, some men and angels were predestinated unto everlasting life, and others foreordained to death, these angels and men, thus predestinated and foreordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed, and their number is so certain and definite that it can not be either increased or diminished; neither are any others redeemed by Christ, effectually called, justified, adopted, sanctified and saved, but the *elect only*; the rest of mankind, God was pleased to pass by, and to *ordain* them to dishonor and wrath, for their sins, to the praise of his glorious justice.'

Presbyterian Confession of Faith, pp. 15, 19.

The Methodist must, agreeable to their Discipline, (chapt. 2, sect. 6 and 7,) exclude her, and at her expulsion, shall read to her from the Discipline, (chapt. 2, sect. 7.) "After such forms of trial and expulsion, such persons shall have *no privileges of society or of Sacraments in our church, without contrition, confession, and proper trial.*" The sister being expelled for embracing Presbyterian doctrine, and wearing a fashionable dress, immediately unites with the Presbyterian church, and taking a certificate of her standing, she returns next Lord's day, and offers to commune with the Methodists. They ask her if she is *sorry* that she embraced such wicked doctrine, and put on such apparel? She says no. They ask if she will

come on *trial* for six months? She says no. Will they now admit her to the Lord's table? If they do, they break their discipline; if they do not, it can only be because she is a Presbyterian; and if they can not admit her, how can they admit the whole Presbyterian church? If ever a Methodist should ask you to commune with them, it would be an appropriate reply to say, *your Discipline forbids it*. However open communion some churches are in practice, it is still evident that such practice at once violates their own creed and the laws of Christ. The principal difference between the Baptists and pedobaptists in this matter is, that the Baptists adhere to the Bible and their creed, while the pedobaptists discard both for the sake of open communion.

In the Lord's commission he determined the *order* of administering the two Sacraments. Matt. xxviii 18—20: "Go ye therefore and μαθητεύσατε *make disciples* of all nations βαπτίζοντες *immersing* them, &c., teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever I have commanded you." Matt. xxvi. 26: "Take, eat, this is my body, &c." The *first* work is to make disciples, the *second* to immerse them, the *third* to teach them to do as Christ had commanded the Apostles; that is, to partake of the Lord's Supper among other duties. In addition to this law we have Christ's example. The Savior was immersed, Matt. iii. 13—17: but he did not eat the supper till Matt. xxvi. 26—30: about three years after. We have no authority for changing the order or substantial elements of the Sacraments. If we should change the bread and wine for cheese and water, or administer the wine before the bread, would pedobaptists join with us in these innovations? If it were a Baptist or a pedobaptist table, we might make new rules for its administration. But it is the LORD'S TABLE, and we must observe the LORD'S LAWS respecting it. All churches require

some qualifications in the candidate for the Lord's Supper, and consider them indispensable. Hence, to consistently commune among themselves, even pedobaptists must agree as to the number and kind of prerequisites. How can two walk together except they be agreed; (Amos iii. 3.) And how can they agree, except they unitedly follow the inspired rule. "It is an *indispensable* qualification for this ordinance, that the candidate for communion be a member of the visible church of Christ, in full standing. By this I intend that he shall be such a member of the church as I have formerly described, to wit: That he should be a person of piety, that he should have made a public profession of religion, and that he should have been baptized.

Dwight's Theol., Sermon 160.

Mr. Sawyer says, p. 21, 'Sprinkling is baptism, and immersion is not.' Hence, those who are immersed are not qualified to partake at his communion table.—The Baptists say, that immersion is baptism, and those who are only sprinkled are not qualified for communion at the Lord's table. Here is an obstruction to our union, and the only way to remove it is to let the scriptures decide what is Baptism. For 'the question concerning a church in order to communion, ought to be, what is her substantial character, has she *the truth, the ordinances, the spirit of Christ.*'

Dr. J. M. Mason's Plea, p. 342.

The practice of the Apostles is a faithful comment on the Savior's law; as the Lord's supper is a *church act*, it was not administered by the Apostles till after the church was organized: Acts ii. 42. The 120 at Acts i. 15—22, were all baptized believers. When Peter preached, Acts ii. 14—36, many were convicted or pricked in their heart, and cried out, Acts ii. 37, what shall we do? Peter said, repent and be immersed.—Then they that gladly received his word or believed in Christ, Acts ii. 41, were immersed and added to

them, and they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread.— Here, several things are expressed and practiced. 1. We find a church of one hundred and twenty baptized believers. 2. We find three thousand converted. 3. These three thousand are baptized. 4. They are added to the church. 5. They agree in faith with the church. 6. They are acknowledged in church fellowship. 7. They partake of the Lord's supper. As these are apostolical prerequisites we dare not add or diminish; therefore, this is, and ever has been the creed of the true church: '*The fellowship of the apostles is linked to the apostles doctrines, and to their breaking of bread and prayers, Acts ii. 42; and if a church defects from the same, it sets other churches loose in like manner from communion with them.— Unity of faith binds them mutually to observe the rules of fraternal communion, and a defection in faith gives discharge from them.*' J. Kittlewell's Works, vol. 2, p. 599.

'I agree with the advocates of close communion in two points: 1. That baptism is the initiating ordinance, which introduces us into the visible church; of course where there is no baptism there are no visible churches. 2. That we ought not to commune with those who are not baptized, and of course are not church members, even if we regard them as Christians. Should a pious Quaker so far depart from his principles, as to wish to commune with me at the Lord's table, while he yet refused to be baptized, I could not receive him; because there is such a relationship established between the two ordinances that I have no right to separate them. The only question then is, whether baptism by sprinkling is valid baptism?' Dr. Griffin's (President of William's College,) Letter on Baptism.

Pedobaptists justify close communion by their own practice. Suppose here are thirty unbaptized converts, the father, mother, brothers, sisters, &c., of Mr. Saw-

yer. The Lord's supper is to be administered in his church, and all these converts go to commune with Mr. Sawyer, will he admit them while unbaptized? certainly not; but, suppose he sprinkles ten of them, and they partake of the supper, the remaining twenty refusing to be baptized are not admitted. The next Lord's day the whole thirty offer themselves to our communion, but we can not admit any of them, because they are not baptized; suppose that ten of those who were not sprinkled are now immersed, and admitted to fellowship in the Baptist church, the remaining twenty can not be admitted, although ten have been sprinkled. The remaining ten unite with the Quakers. Now none of these sects can partake of the Lord's supper together; for neither the Baptist, nor the pedobaptist will partake with the Quakers. By this illustration it is evident, that Mr. Sawyer will not commune with his own father, &c. whatever evidence they may give of piety, until, in his judgment they are baptized. Pedobaptists say that we put up the *bars*, by not admitting them to commune with the Baptists. But suppose that the two sacraments are to be administered in the Baptist church; the elements are prepared, and a pedobaptist appears, saying, Sir, I wish to commune with your church. We ask, what do you mean by *communing*? He replies, to partake of one of the sacraments. We ask, how many sacraments are there in Christ's church? He replies, two: baptism and the Lord's supper. We ask, which is to be received first? He replies, baptism. We ask, will you partake with us in the first? He replies, no; baptism is a mere *non-essential*; I will have nothing to do with it except to *ridicule* and throw *contempt* upon it, and *on those who practice it*; but I wish to commune with you in the second sacrament, the Lord's supper. We reply, if you can not partake with us in the first sacrament, we can not invert and break the divine rules to

give you the second. The pedobaptist replies then, you put up the *bars* against me. We reply, no, if there are any bars they are put up by the pedobaptists, for while you refuse to commune with us in the first sacrament how can we partake with you in the second. When we ask the pedobaptists to come and partake with us in the first sacrament, they say we are proselyting, and obstinately refuse; but when they ask us to partake with them in the second ordinance, if we decline, they say we are bigoted and close communion; but we have as much ground for complaining because pedobaptists will not come and be baptized with us, as they have to be troubled because we will not partake of the Lord's supper with them.

A short time since a pedobaptist brother of this city related to me an occurrence respecting a certain baptist minister, refusing to admit a Presbyterian lady to the Lord's supper. She being about to leave the town, and reside where she could not have church privileges. While I was amused with his weakness, I pitied his ignorance, and left him. The actors in this scene, to which he had reference, were not a Baptist minister and a Presbyterian lady, but J. M. Mason, D. D., a Presbyterian minister in the city of New-York in 1810, and a female member of the Dutch Reformed Church; an account of which you will find in Dr. Mason's Plea, p. 6, as related by the publisher of that work in 1816. Dr. Mason, said, 'one of these occasions it was impossible for him to forget; he had been distributing tokens of admission to the Lord's supper; after the congregation had retired he perceived a young woman at the lower end of an aisle, reclining in a pensive attitude; as he approached her she said, Sir, I am afraid I have done wrong. Doctor. Why have you done wrong? Lady. I went up with the communicants and received a token, but am not a member of your church, and I could not be at rest till

I had spoken to you about it. Dr. To what church do you belong? L. The Dutch Reformed church, and if you wish it I can satisfy you of my character and standing there. Dr. But what made you come for a token without mentioning the matter before? L. I had not an opportunity, as I did not know in time that your communion was to be next Lord's day; I am sorry if I have done wrong, but I expect to leave the city on Tuesday, and to be absent I can not tell how long, in a part of the country where I shall have no opportunity of communing, and I wished once more before I went away to join with Christians in showing forth my Savior's death. He (Doctor) consulted a moment with the church officers, who were still present, and it was thought most expedient *not to grant her request*; he communicated this answer, as gently as possible, to the modest petitioner. She said not another word, but, with one hand giving back the token, and with the other putting up her kerchief to her eyes, turned away, struggling with her anguish and the tears streaming down her cheeks.

But, it is asked, why are churches so close communion? We reply, the scriptures require it, and their whole precept and example are opposed to open communion. There is not an instance recorded in the Bible of two denominations partaking of the Lord's supper together. *John, the Baptist*, was not a Methodist, or Presbyterian; and as Christ and the apostles were baptized by him, they all belonged to the same denomination; and it is evident, from their inspired writings, that the apostolic denomination was close communion. 2 Thess. iii. 6, 'Now we command you, brethren, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every *brother* that walketh disorderly, and not after the *παράδοσιν* (*tradition or instruction*) which he received of us.' See also Matt. v. 23, 24: Eph. ii. 19—22: 1 Cor. i. 9, 10: Heb. xiii.

9, 10. We solemnly believe that infant sprinkling and open communion is disorderly walk, for we have no such traditions or instructions, from the apostles' precept or example; and therefore we can neither practice such things ourselves, nor countenance them in others.

Pedobaptists say they will commune with all believers. If this is true, they make faith the only qualification for the Lord's supper, and all with whom they refuse to communicate are not pious. But there are about one hundred and thirty denominations of Christians, and no pedobaptist will commune with more than eight or ten of them. 'Those who have been educated in Arianism and Socinianism and are not yet brought off from these fundamental errors, are by no means admitted to the Lord's supper.'

President Edwards' Works, vol. 4, p. 409.

If pedobaptists admit those to their communion who condemn and ridicule their confession of faith, it proves that they esteem their creed of no value. And what is gained by open communion? Partaking of the Lord's supper changes no man's faith; nor does it in the least unite the different denominations. The Presbyterian leaves the Lord's table, saying, '*God has foreordained whatsoever comes to pass, whether sin or holiness.*' And the Methodist leaves the same table saying, '*He who is a child of God to-day may be a child of the Devil to-morrow.*'—(Methodist Discipline, 1808 edition, p. 92.)

The Methodists, Presbyterians, and Episcopalians have professed open communion for many years. Yet they harmonize no more than the Baptists and Presbyterians do. But it is said we must have *charity* for those who err in faith, and lay aside our creeds and sectarian feelings when we come to the Lord's table; but is it that *same charity* which prompts the different denominations to take up their creeds and condemn all sects but their own, when they have left

the Lord's table? If it is I am constrained to say, that it is not that charity which thinketh no evil. Is there no way of exercising charity but by open communion? Charity and open communion are not the same thing, if they were the apostle's writings could be thus translated: 1 Cor. xiii. 13: 'Now abideth faith, hope, and *αγαπη* open communion, these three; but the greatest of these is *αγαπη* open communion.' Col. iii. 12—14: 'Put on therefore, as the elect of God, holy and beloved, bowels of mercy, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, long suffering, forgiving one another as Christ forgave you; and *above all these things*, put on open communion which is the bond of perfectness.' Gal. v. 6: 'Neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but faith which walketh by *αγαπης* open communion.' John xiii. 35: 'By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have *αγαπην* open communion one to another.' Gal. v. 14: 'For all the law is fulfilled in one word, *αγαπηςτις*, open communion.'

The word *αγαπη* occurs 112 times in the New Testament. In 23 instances it is translated *charity*, as at 1 Cor. xiii. 4, 8, 13. In one instance *dear*, Col. i. 13. And in 88 instances *love*, as at Luke xi. 42: John v. 42: xv. 9, 10, 13: xvii. 26: Rom. v. 5, 8: viii. 35, 39: Eph. i. 4: ii. 4. Hence charity is *love* not love to *error and sin*, but love to God, to his laws to good order, and to holiness for holiness' sake.—*Charity is not a fool*, but readily distinguishes truth from error, for although, 1 Cor. xiii. 4, 6: 'Charity suffereth long and is kind; yet it thinketh no evil, rejoiceth not in iniquity, but *rejoiceth in the truth*. And while it is the spirit of charity to love all good men, and good things; yet God, the author of charity, hates sin, reprove error, and has no fellowship with such as do not the truth. And the great apostle Paul, who has often been quoted as a pattern of charity,

'accommodated himself to all classes of men, and all their customs, whenever such customs did not *imply* a surrender of truth; about customs, as customs, he strove not; yet this same condescending, accommodating Paul, who went every length, consistent with the safety of substantial principles, would not stir a hair's breadth at the hazard of injuring them; here he was unyielding, unmanageable, inexorable as death.'

Dr. J. M. Mason's Plea, p. 54.

Pedobaptists say, we shall all commune together in heaven, and why not on earth: the Lord communes with, blesses, and multiplies the numbers of the Methodists, Presbyterians, &c., and yet the Baptists will not commune with us.

That the Lord blesses, and multiplies the number of Baptists and Roman Catholics is equally true; yet this common blessing does not prove the faith and practice of either sect correct, and as to our communing together in heaven, we must recollect that there is not a literal table of bread and wine above the skies. Rom. xiv. 17: 'For the kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost.'

That the Baptists will have lost all their errors, should they be found in heaven at last, is evident, and it is equally evident, that there must be a great change in the spirit and practice of the Methodists and Presbyterians, before they have much *peace* and joy in the Holy Ghost among themselves. And as to the assertion, that the Lord communes with them, they can not mean that He eats the bread and drinks the wine of the eucharist, but they must refer to the fact that God is with them, and assists them in preaching, praying, singing, and other labors for the salvation of souls. In all these labors the Baptists rejoice to commune with the pedobaptists, and will ever pray for a reciprocation.

The Baptists can not admit that sprinkling is baptism, or pouring is baptism; hence they can not partake of the Lord's supper with the pedobaptists, for the Bible and all enlightened Christians affirm, that baptism must precede the eucharist.

'No church ever gave the communion to any person before they were baptized. Among all the absurdities that ever were held, none ever maintained that any person should partake of the communion before he was baptized.'

Dr. Wall's History of Infant Baptism, chapt. 9, sect. 2.

'The supper of the Lord ought not to be administered to persons that are unbaptized, for before baptism men are not considered as members of the visible church.'

Benj. Pictet's Theol. Hist. p. 959.

'If this ordinance be thus holy in its nature and hallowed in its titles, it clearly follows that no ignorant, no *unbaptized*, no wicked person can be allowed to approach the table.'

Methodist Guide to the Lord's Supper, by J. Sutcliff, p. 28.

'This food is called by us the eucharist, of which it is not lawful for any to partake but such as believe the things that are taught by us to be true and have been baptized.'

Justin Martyr's Apol. 2, p. 162.

But it is said the want of baptism is not the objection, for the Baptists will not commune with all Christians who are baptized. We admit that it is not the *only* obstacle; yet this is an insurmountable one. Suppose, for example, that ten *immersed* members of a pedobaptist church propose to unite in communion with a Baptist church; these individuals, though baptized themselves, habitually commune with unbaptized churches, and thus constantly sanction the practice of communion in an unbaptized state. Now we insist that whatever would be considered unscriptural and a disciplinable offense in our own members, and would if persisted in exclude them from our fellowship, must equally debar the individuals in question. But if ha-

bitual intercommunion with unbaptized churches would not exclude an individual member of our church then it would be right for us all to practice it; and if it is right for us to sanction the practice of communion in an unbaptized state, then it would be right for us as churches to practice communion without baptism; and right to remove an institution of Jesus Christ from the position he has assigned it; right to deviate from the original pattern of church organization designed by infinite wisdom, and repeatedly presented by the inspired writers for our imitation. We shall therefore be compelled either to abandon the position that baptism is a prerequisite to the Lord's supper, or debar alike from our church fellowship those who practice communion without baptism, and those who by intercommunion with them sanction the practice. There is no alternative, there is no middle ground; if the premises are true, the consequences must inevitably follow.

It is offered as a reason for extending church fellowship to immersed members of pedobaptist churches, that such a course would have a tendency to promote the practice of immersion among pedobaptists, inasmuch as many of them would be induced to be immersed from the consideration that it would secure to them the privilege of communing with the Baptist churches. But this would really '*be doing evil that good might come,*' and besides this, the influence would have directly an opposite tendency. Can we think to win others to the observance of Christ's laws, by virtually receding from his laws ourselves? The most effectual way to teach others to revere the institutions of Christ, is to *revere them ourselves*. In refusing to commune with baptized persons, we only come upon common ground with the Presbyterians, &c.; for they will not commune with all whom they acknowledge baptized. The Arians and Uni-

versalists immerse, and the Socinians and Roman Catholics sprinkle, but orthodox pedobaptists will not commune with any of them, although they admit that many of them are Christians. In the case of the Baptist, as in the case of pedobaptist churches, the want of baptism is a defect in the candidate; but the fundamental difficulty is the candidate's error in faith, of which his external actions, as sprinkling, &c., are but evidences; and so long as the man is erroneous in faith he will continue to act wrong, and advocate error; consequently no consistent church can receive him. Some defects in faith, such as falling from grace, sprinkling for baptism, open communion and infant church membership, are not as fatal as Arianism and Universalism; yet they equally destroy *church fellowship*. If a man should be *immersed*, and yet believe the peculiar sentiments of the pedobaptists, this defect in faith would be incompatible with his good standing in a Baptist church. Hence our care in examining candidates for church fellowship, and our discipline when church members become defective in faith.

Now if we refuse to receive, and do discipline and exclude such as are, in our judgment, holding errors, (and what church does not?) how can we give the Lord's supper, which is the highest act of church fellowship, to such as we refuse to receive as members, and would expel if they were members with us? The fact of their having united with a pedobaptist church, has by no means removed the ground of our objection. If regeneration and immersion are the only qualifications for communion, then we must commune with many of our excluded members; for while we have lost church fellowship for them, and are obliged to exclude them, we still have a *Christian fellowship* for them: and, when they repent of that particular offense for which they were expelled, we receive them into church

fellowship again without requiring a new experience, or a new baptism.

The Bible requires us all to be united in faith as well as in practice; and if ever there is a time when we should be perfectly of one mind, it is when we commemorate the death of our Savior: 1 Cor. i. 10, 'Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all *speake the same thing*, and that there be no divisions among you, but that ye be *perfectly joined together in the same mind*, and in the same judgment.' 1 Cor. 'x. 16, 17, 'The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? the bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? for we being *many are one bread, and one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread.*' The apostle here offers strong reasons why we should all be of *one mind* when we come to the Lord's table. The bread which we break, though made up of many particles, is one loaf; and we, being many, are, at the communion table, all one body; and by partaking of that one loaf, we say to each other and to the world, that we are all of one mind; and if we are not, we make a false representation in communing. Hence Christ says, Matt. v. 23, 24, "Therefore, if thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way, first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift;" and Paul says, Rom. xvi. 17, 'Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offenses *contrary to the doctrine* which ye have learned, and avoid them.' See also John xvii. 21—23: Rom. xii. 5: 1 Cor. xii. 20: Col. i. 24: Eph. iv. 15, 16—25: Matt. xii. 25.

There are but two things which keep all Christians from being united—first the want of union in faith,

and secondly the want of union in practice. But our practice is the result of our faith, and we can not honestly join in practice, any further than we agree in faith. This principle is acted upon by the Baptist at the communion table, and by the pedobaptist in many other religious matters. The Rev. J. W. Eaton, pastor of the Baptist church in Bridgeport, Conn., was conducting a protracted meeting in his church, and wishing assistance, addressed a line to the Rev. J. H. Hunter, affectionately soliciting him and his church to unite in the work of laboring for the salvation of souls, and received in reply a letter bearing date Feb. 12, 1839, of which the following is an extract :

‘There is one consideration, which, to my mind, creates an impediment in the way of my co-operating with you in the manner you have suggested. If the Baptist church and her ministry, within this place or elsewhere, while they believed and maintained that in administering baptism by immersion, and withholding the ordinance from infants, they followed a more excellent way—were still willing to concede that the administration of the ordinance by sprinkling is a *valid* and *sufficient* baptism; and that in applying the rite to children, we do not abuse and pervert it from its original design—the way would be open, so far as I can perceive, for concerted action in other respects. I do not insist upon the bar of close communion, for here I conceive that you are at least consistent with your other principles, in reference to baptism. Since I can not agree with the celebrated Robert Hall in his defense of open communion, who supposes that baptism is not an essential preliminary for admission to the Lord’s supper.’

I remark *First*. This is true pedobaptist ground. They usually refuse to unite with the Baptists in laboring for the salvation of souls; and the reason, as Mr. Hunter says, is because we differ in faith and

practice respecting baptism. With this in mind, how can they complain of our declining to partake of the Lord's supper with them, for the same reason.

Secondly. It is known that in Europe and America there is a sect of Christians denominated Open Communion Baptists. This sect and the regular Baptists, are as distinct as the Presbyterians and Episcopalians. Pedobaptists, who have not read extensively, have supposed that Robert Hall and others conceded that sprinkling was as valid baptism as immersion, and therefore admitted pedobaptists to the Lord's supper as baptized persons. But this is not correct. The position of Mr. Hall, and other Open Communion Baptists is, that immersion is baptism, and sprinkling is not; but they do not consider baptism an essential preliminary to the Lord's supper, as the Rev. Mr. Hunter says. They therefore commune with pedobaptists as *unbaptized* Christians.

Thirdly: As the Rev. Mr. Hunter says, this open communion Baptist sentiment is evidently *inconsistent*; for it is a well known fact, that all Baptist churches do baptize all sprinkled Christians that join them. Now while we believe with the pedobaptists, that baptism is an essential prerequisite to the Lord's supper, suppose we should admit to the communion one who was only sprinkled, and afterwards that same person should be convinced that his sprinkling was not baptism, and request to be immersed; would the Baptists appear *consistent* to baptize one whom they had already admitted to the Lord's supper.

Fourthly: Since the Rev. Mr. Hunter has introduced Robert Hall, we will remark on two other positions of his. Mr. Hall says, "If a man is fit for the kingdom of heaven, he is fit for all the ordinances this side." This we readily admit; but still we do insist that God has established the order in which they should be received; and we should be as willing to be ruled by Christ's laws as saved by his grace; but

he who communes without being *immersed*, partakes in disobedience.

Again, Mr. Hall says, "It is the Lord's table, and all the Lord's people should come to it." We admit it is the *Lord's table*, and so is the church the *Lord's house*; and if we are obliged on this account to receive to communion all who wish to partake with us, whether we think they have the requisite qualifications or not, we must for the same reason receive to membership all who wish to join the church, whether we esteem them qualified or not: for if they are entitled on this ground to a seat at the Lord's table with us, they must be equally entitled to permanent membership. But no church on earth acknowledges this principle in the reception of members, nor can they consistently act on it in admitting persons to the communion. That pedobaptists consider themselves baptized, does not alter the case as it respects *our* duty; for unless *we* deem them baptized, we cannot conscientiously commune with them.

Although pedobaptists will give the Lord's supper to those *only* whom they esteem baptized, and thus are opposed to Open Communion Baptist principles, yet they have fallen into other errors equally great; for while they will exclude their own members for discarding infant sprinkling, they cheerfully invite to their communion the Baptists, who totally and constantly oppose it.

"New-England churches will suffer *no man* to continue a member of their communion who scruples infant baptism, or refuses to be present at the administration of it; and he that opposes infant baptism, or purposely departs the congregation at the administration of that ordinance, is liable, *by their laws*, to sentence of BANISHMENT." Dr. Lightfoot's Works. vol. 2, p. 531.

Although Congregationalists will exclude from their churches, and *banish* from the country, those who op-

pose infant sprinkling, still they say they wish for a Christian union with the Baptists. We can assure them that we are desirous of an union on gospel grounds; but while baptism in faith and practice is the great bar between us, it devolves on pedobaptists to remove it. This they can do, consistently with themselves and the Bible, while we can not; for they plead that immersion, pouring, and sprinkling, are equally valid baptism. Now all they have to do is to drop their sprinkling and pouring, and practice immersion *only*, and this difficulty is removed; and while it is just as far from us to the pedobaptists as it is from the pedobaptists to us, if they wish an union, why not come over; especially, as they can do it without any sacrifice of principle. But we can not go over to the pedobaptists without a sacrifice of principle; for if we commune with them before they renounce their sprinkling, we either grant that sprinkling is baptism, or that baptism is not a prerequisite to communion.

Pedobaptists say they will commune with all such persons as they hope to meet in heaven; but still they refuse to administer baptism to the infants of persons who are not members of their church. "The infants of one or both believing parents are to be baptized, and *those only*." Saybrook Platform, chap 29, sec. 4.

Here they declare that the infants of unconverted persons are not saved, or confess themselves close communion and *close baptism* too, for they withhold both ordinances from these infants; and even their own baptized infant church members, to whom they say the blessings of the covenant of grace are sealed, (among which blessings must be the Lord's supper,) are not admitted to the communion, and many pedobaptists have complained of this close communion conduct. "I confess myself yet unsatisfied as to any convincing argument whereby it can be proved that

any were denied admission to the Lord's supper, who were owned as members." Dr. Lightfoot's Works, vol. ii. p. 433.

"If infants are capable of admission to the church above, they must be equally fit subjects of that, on earth: whom God receives as subjects of his grace, we have no right to exclude from the visible fellowship of his people." L. A. Sawyer's Critical Dissertation, p. 12.

The reason why pedobaptists have such struggles of conscience about infant communion, is because they know that Christ has said, Matt. xix. 14, "*Suffer the little children and forbid them not to come unto me, for of such is the kingdom of heaven.*" Mark x. 14; Luke xviii. 16. But they are keeping these infant church members *from Christ* and his sacrament of the supper, to which they are as justly entitled as they are to baptism; and how can a mother feel reconciled in receiving the elements from the hands of a priest who is so close communion that he will not allow her to give a bit of the sacramental bread to her own baptized infant which she holds in her arms.—It is replied by some, that infants are incapable of *examining* themselves, and therefore should not eat: But they are equally incapable of *believing*, and therefore should not be baptized. If the Bible warrants giving one ordinance, it does both. Matthew xix. 6, "What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder."

Pedobaptists plead that they are *sincere* in believing that sprinkling is baptism, therefore it is right.—But if sincerity makes a practice right, then the Baptists are right also, for we *sincerely* believe that immersion is baptism and sprinkling is not: and while communion is a church act, we can not extend it beyond church government and fellowship: for how can we commune with those over whose conduct we have no control.

In speaking of the immersion of females, Mr. Sawyer says, page 23, "There is often a severe struggle in their minds between propriety and duty, and if the latter prevails, as agreeably to their belief it ought, it prevails at the expense of the former. Effusion and sprinkling are free from any objections of this kind, and are adapted to excite only the purest and most spiritual affections." I could reply, by relating many substantial facts, one of which must suffice:—

In Monroe county, New-York, there lived a Mrs. ———, who believed that immersion was baptism, but did not believe in close communion: to get clear of the latter, she concluded to exchange the former for sprinkling, and accordingly united with the Presbyterians. At the time she was sprinkled the Spirit reproved her, and she knew she was doing wrong; but for the sake of enjoying open communion she submitted to it, and took her seat at the Lord's table. When the bread was approaching her conscience told her that she was not baptized, and therefore ought not to commune: she was much distressed, and declined.— When the wine was passed she was still more distressed, and refused to partake. She now looked round upon the communicants, and realized that they were all partaking without being baptized, and she said the place appeared *horrible* to her. She arose and left the house, and like Peter, she went out and wept bitterly, and remained out until the congregation was dismissed. She stepped into the carriage, bidding farewell to the place, and a few days after this she related these exercises, together with her religious experience, to us, and I baptized her; and she often afterwards referred to this *effectual and practical cure of open communion*.

I shall close these remarks in the language of Dr. Lightfoot. "This *new notion* of occasional communion in some parts of worship, (Lord's supper,) ex-

clusively to others, (exchanging pulpits, church discipline, &c.) is disowned by all sorts of (consistent) churches, and is a *late fancy*, taken up purposely to avoid the charge of superstition. ————— Why should not those general rules of approving the things that are most excellent, and holding fast that which is good, persuade such a man that it is not lawful to leave the best communion, merely to show what defective and tolerable churches he can communicate with; which is as if a man should forsake his muskmellon to let others see what pumpkins he can swallow."

Dr. Lightfoot's Works, vol. ii. p. 531.

BAPTISM OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

This expression is sometimes written simply, He shall baptize you *in the Holy Spirit*, ἐν Πνεύματι ἁγίῳ; as Mark i. 8: Acts i. 5: John i. 33—sometimes fully, *in the Holy Spirit and fire*, ἐν Πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρὶ; as Matt. iii. 11: Luke iii. 16. This phraseology corresponds exactly with the Greek, and is supported by nearly all the ancient versions, as well as by many eminent critics. Πνεῦμα ἁγίον καὶ πῦρ, 'the Holy Spirit and fire,' is put for πῦρ πνεύματος ἁγίου, the fire of the Holy Spirit, or πνεῦμα ἁγίον πῦρος, the Holy Spirit of fire. Compare 1 Kings xix. 12, Heb. 'stillness and a voice,' for a still voice. Ex. xiv. 20, 'a cloud and darkness,' for a dark cloud. Matt. iv. 16, χώρα καὶ σκία θανάτου, 'the region and shadow of death,' for χώρα σκίας θανάτου, the region of the shadow of death, as some MSS. actually read in Isa. ix. 2: Luke xxi. 15, στόμα καὶ σοφία, 'a mouth and wisdom,' for στόμα σοφίας, a mouth of wisdom, perhaps equivalent to λόγος σοφίας, 1 Cor. xii. 8. Compare also Acts vi. 10, σοφία καὶ πνεῦμα, 'wisdom and spirit,' with Eph. i. 17, πνεῦμα σοφίας, spirit of wisdom. Πῦρ, *fire*, is taken for the

element of *light*. Some oriental nations at the present day, in metaphorical expressions, use the term *fire* for *light*.

It was predicted that the reign of the Messiah should be distinguished by the prevalence of spiritual light or knowledge. Dan. xii. 4, Many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased. Isa. liv. 13, And all thy children shall be taught of the Lord. Jer. xxxi. 34, And they shall teach no more every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord; for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord. Compare Heb. viii. and 1 John v. 20. Again it is said, Isa. xlii. 6, 7, I will give thee (i. e. the Messiah) for a *light* of the Gentiles; to open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from the prison, and them that sit in darkness out of the prison-house. Isa. lx. 1, Arise, shine; for thy *light* is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee. Accordingly in the New Testament Christ is called the *light* of the world, and his people, the *children of light*, *τιοι φωτός*. They were once darkness; but are now light in the Lord. They were blind, but God hath shined in their hearts. The eyes of their understanding are enlightened.—They have received the *Spirit* of God, that they may *know* the things that are freely given to them of God. Thus the reign of the Messiah is generally distinguished as a dispensation of light; and in the apostolical age, Christians, especially the teachers of Christianity, enjoyed the miraculous influence of the Spirit. Hence, to denote how universally their mind was pervaded with spiritual light, they were said to be *baptized*, i. e. *immersed*, in the *Spirit of light*. *Baptizo* just as clearly signifies immersion in this connection, as it does in any other. The Greek fathers could not have been mistaken as to the meaning of the expression; and they certainly understood it in this sense.

Theophylact, commenting on the words, '*He shall baptize you in the Holy Spirit,*' etc. Matt. iii. 11 : says, '*That is, He shall inundate you, τοῦτες, κατακλύσει ὑμᾶς,* abundantly with the gifts of the Spirit.' Cyril of Jerusalem, Cateches. 17, 8, says : 'For as he that goes down into the water and is baptized, is surrounded on all sides by the water, so the apostles were totally baptized (immersed) by the Spirit. The water surrounds the body externally, but the Spirit incomprehensibly baptizes (immerses) the soul within.'

That 'baptism in the Spirit and fire,' is spoken of the *illuminating* influences of the Spirit, will appear from several considerations. The prophecy of Joel, quoted by Peter, Acts ii. 17, 18., naturally leads us to this conclusion. *Dreams* and *visions* were the usual means by which God revealed his will; and these terms taken figuratively, denote here the extraordinary communications of spiritual knowledge which his servants should enjoy under the gospel dispensation.

The design of this baptism conducts to the same view of the subject. The introduction of the gospel was the most remarkable event in the annals of time; it was the commencement of a mighty revolution, or the moral regeneration of the world; (Matt. xix. 28;) and the point of time occupied by the first Christian teachers, was one of infinite importance. The bigoted Jew and the superstitious Gentile, were equally and inveterately hostile to the cause. Hence it was needful for them to be endued with clear and accurate perceptions of divine truth, as well as with an intellectual energy and moral courage, and the gifts of the Spirit were designed to furnish them with these qualifications. Accordingly Jesus told the apostles not to premeditate when they were brought before magistrates and kings; for the Holy Ghost should *teach* them what to say—that the Comforter, the Holy Ghost, should *teach* them all things, and bring all things to

their remembrance which he had said to them—and that they should receive *power* after the Holy Ghost was come upon them; and should be witnesses for him, both in Jerusalem and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth.

Some persons have supposed that regeneration and the baptism of the Holy Spirit is one and the same thing, but this is evidently a mistake; for we find many Christians spoken of in the Bible who were never baptized with the Holy Ghost, while others in distinction from them are spoken of as being thus baptized. The baptism of the Holy Spirit was a miracle, and usually conferred to prepare the subject of it for some miraculous work, as prophecy, speaking with tongues, &c.; and of course ceased when the Scriptures were all written, as other miracles did. It was not only a distinct action from regeneration, but usually subsequent to it. Thus Jesus Christ, who never was regenerated, was baptized with the Holy Ghost. Luke iii. 22: Isa. xlii. 1: lxi. 1. John baptized penitent believers in water, but these were to be subsequently baptized with the Holy Ghost by Jesus Christ. Matt. iii. 11. The apostles were baptized with the Holy Ghost long after they were regenerated and called to the apostleship. John xx. 22: Acts i. 5—8: ii. 4: iv. 8. The promise of the gift of the Holy Ghost, Acts ii. 38, was on condition that they should first repent and be baptized. The disciples at Samaria believed, Acts viii. 12, and were baptized with water; but afterwards, when the apostles came down, they were baptized with the Holy Ghost. Acts viii. 14—17. Paul received the Holy Ghost after he was converted. Acts ix. 17. Cornelius, who feared God with *all his house*, Acts x. 2, was baptized with all his house and spake with tongues, Acts x. 44—47: xi. 15—17. The twelve believers whom John had baptized, Acts xix. 2—6, were baptized with the Holy

Ghost and spake with tongues and prophecied; and the uniform testimony of the Scriptures are, Eph. i. 13, "*After that ye believed ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise,*" and all the recorded effects of this baptism go to confirm this idea. It seems probable from Acts ix. 17, that Paul received the baptism of the Spirit immediately after his conversion. Nothing, however, is here said of the effects; but from other passages we learn that he 'spake with tongues,' 'wrought miracles,' etc.



CONTENTS.

	Page
Preface,	3
Review of Mr. Sawyer on the action of Baptism,	7
Do. on the subjects of Baptism,	19
THE COVENANTS,	26
1 Covenant of Redemption,	29
2 Covenant of Grace,	30
3 Covenant of Circumcision,	33
4 The Mosaic Covenant,	44
THE CHURCH OF GOD,	49
1 Christ's Priesthood not Jewish,	50
2 The Jewish Church and the Church of God not one and the same,	60
3 Pagan Persecutions,	68
4 The origin of the Arians,	71
5 The origin of the Roman Catholics and Papal per- secutions,	72
6 The origin of the Lutherans,	75
7 The origin of the Presbyterians,	75
8 The origin of the Congregationalists,	76
9 The origin of the Episcopalians,	76
10 The origin of the Methodists,	77
11 The origin of the Baptists,	78
SUBJECTS OF BAPTISM,	98
1 The Baptism of John,	105
2 The Baptism of our Savior,	107
3 John's Baptism and Christian Baptism the same,	109
4 The Baptism of the Apostles,	112
5 The origin of Infant Baptism,	124
6 The evils of Infant Baptism,	130
THE ACTION OF BAPTISM, (prepositions,)	134
1 Mosaic Baptisms,	137
2 The waters of Palestine,	143
3 The origin of Sprinkling,	145
4 Versions of the Bible,	148
5 Direct arguments for Immersion,	154
6 Lexicons,	156
7 The classic use of <i>βαπτω</i> ,	158

	Page
8 The classic use of βαπτίζω,	150
9 The Sacred use of βαπτω,	159
10 The Sacred use of βαπτίζω,	160
11 Baptism a burial,	163
12 The Savior's Baptism an example for believers,	166
13 Baptism a saving ordinance,	166
THE LORD'S SUPPER,	170
1 Infant Communion,	172
2 Scotch Churches Close Communion,	175
3 Saybrook Platform,	176
4 The Baptist persecuted in America,	178
5 The Church of England Close Communion,	184
6 The Methodist Close Communion,	187
7 The Scriptures prove Close Communion,	190
8 Pedobaptist objections answered,	192
BAPTISM OF THE HOLY SPIRIT,	209

ERRATA.

In some copies, page 97, read *Ireneaus* instead of *Clement*.

Page 102, did *grant* liberty, instead of *great* liberty.

Page 113, for *saving* read *miraculous*.

Page 114, for *Whitley*, read *Whitby*.

Page 135, for Deut. xiv. 15, 16, read Lev. xiv. 15, 16.

Page 153, for *congregation*, read *church*.

Mr. Chapin, page 79, is an Episcopal minister and editor of the Chronicle.

Entered according to act of Congress, in the year 1838, by ISRAEL ROBORDS, in the Clerk's office in the District of Connecticut.

